


OCT 29 1979

Christian Order



Summary of Contents for August/September, 1979

ANALYSIS OF NEO-MODERNISM

THE "FOUNDING FATHERS"

Philip Trower

THE NEW RELIGION OF POLITICS

James Hitchcock

CONCERNING ALIENATION AND
CHRISTIANITY

Henry Edwards

WELCOME TO A FREE LANCER

The Editor

INTERNAL RECONCILIATION
THINKABLE?

J. C. L. Inman

WELCOME US FROM NOVICES

Archbishop Robert J. Dwyer

BREAKDOWN OF CHRISTIAN
VALUES

Rt. Rev. Bernard Stewart

PLEASE NOTE

Since the beginning of this year, appalling postal services at home and abroad have imposed enormous difficulties upon us. We apologise to readers who have been made to share in these difficulties through no fault of ours. Postal services are still bad. Help me, please, to overcome the postal difficulties that remain by renewing your subscription by *return of post on the first reminder*. Many are doing so. I thank them with all my heart. If all did so, remaining difficulties — due to the wretched service the Post Office still gives us—would be at an end. Thank you so much for your support. I am most grateful.

Paul Crane, S.J.

Contents

Page

86 TASK TO BE DONE *The Editor*

88 GENESIS OF NEO-MODERNISM
1: THE "FOUNDING FATHERS"
Philip Trower

92 BREAKDOWN OF CHRISTIAN
VALUES *Rt. Rev. Bernard
Stewart*

95 IS INTERNAL RECONCILIATION
UNTHINKABLE? *J. C. L. Inman*

113 LETTER TO A FREE LANCER
The Editor

126 DELIVER US FROM NOVICES
Archbishop Robert J. Dwyer

129 THE NEW RELIGION OF
POLITICS *James Hitchcock*

139 CONCERNING ALIENATION
AND MARXISM *Henry Edwards*

147 BOOK REVIEW
Rev. V. B. Wrighton

If You Change Your Address :

Please let us know two or three weeks ahead if possible and please send us both new and old addresses. Thank you.

Christian Order is a magazine devoted to Catholic Social Teaching and incisive comment on current affairs in Church and State; at home and abroad; in the political, social and industrial fields. It is published ten times a year.

It is published by Father Paul Crane, S.J., from 65, Belgrave Rd., London, S.W.1. This is the sole postal address to which all communications concerning *Christian Order* should be sent.

Christian Order is obtainable only by subscription and from this address. In the case of those desiring more than one copy, these are obtainable at the subscription rate and should be paid for in advance.

The annual subscription to *Christian Order* is £1 in the United Kingdom and Republic of Ireland; \$3.00 in the United States, Canada and Australia; elsewhere, according to the approximate sterling rate of exchange, in the currency of the country concerned or any convenient currency.

Air-mail rates as follows :

U.S.A., Canada
India etc.—£4.00, U.S. \$8.00
Australia—£4.50, A. \$8.00
N. Zealand—£4.50, N.Z. \$8.00

Christian Order

EDITED BY

Paul Crane SJ

VOLUME 20

AUG./SEPT.

NUMBER 8/9

Task to be Done

THE EDITOR

THE Press called it politics; which only goes to show how ignorant the Press can be. It was the same with the rest of the Media; which only shows how ignorant they too can be. Pope John Paul II was not playing politics on those occasions when he called so insistently and so fearlessly for freedom of religion as he made his triumphant way three months ago through his beloved Poland. The Pope was demanding that the Catholic Church in that country should be free, as by right, to give its message of truth to men and allowed unfettered access to the means of doing so; and that the members of that Church should not be hampered in the practice of their Faith by the hirelings of what was no more than an upstart and interloping atheist regime. Calling as he did for the freedom of men to practice their Faith, the Pope was engaged in no political ploy. He was concerned—and most deeply concerned—with one of the most basic rights of man; that of access to God's truth. As such, his stance was basically moral. Caesar, indeed, might choose to make that right the plaything of politics, but that did not make it political, nor those who defended it politicians. It did make Caesar a fool. What the Pope was doing in Poland was to remind Caesar, however obliquely, that he was not God, as he called on Caesar, as his predecessors had done before in the history of the Church, to

respect man's basic right freely to worship his God and, unhampered, to bring others to do the same.

Somewhat sadly I was forced to reflect, as I read with joy of the Pope's splendid Polish progress, that, within the Catholic Church today, there are numbers of the Faithful who are hampered in the exercise of their basic right, which the Pope upheld so splendidly in Poland. But with this difference. Unlike the Polish case, those who hamper the Faithful in their access to the truth of their Faith are within the very ranks of those who are meant to uphold it. I am thinking of a minority of priests and religious within what is called the post-conciliar Church, who prey on the Faithful by word and bad example and, in so doing, attack what is one of the most basic rights they have as human beings—that of access to God's truth. I am thinking too, of those Bishops and Religious Superiors who make next to no effort to check this clerical and religious minority; who turn a deaf ear when the Faithful come to them with legitimate complaints against the words and works of these few.

Instances are only too numerous. Readers will list them for themselves. No need to enumerate them here. In general, what I have in mind is the far too frequent obscuring of truth in so many ways in the course of what is meant to pass for its propagation in school-room and training college, pastoral and catechetical centre, pulpit, seminary and religious house of study. Too many of these are still shrouded in modernist mist. On them the light of Faith does not shine. It merely flickers. They are of this earth.

Our prayer is that the time will come very soon when this great Pope will deliver the Faithful everywhere from those who persecute the Church from within, with the same authority and courage as he has delivered and will continue to deliver them everywhere from those who persecute them from without. It is perhaps not too much to say that the future of the Church in this country and throughout the world will depend on the ability of John Paul II to undertake this task and bring it to a splendidly successful conclusion. May God give him the strength to do it.

This is the first of a five-part analysis of the history and development of Modernism, which Pope St. Pius X called the "Synthesis of All Heresies". Written by Philip Trower, author and writer, and reader of *Christian Order*, the series is reprinted here with acknowledgements to the American Catholic Weekly, *The Wanderer*. We believe that this series of articles will prove of invaluable help to readers. It is for this reason that we suggest not only that they study it with great care for their own benefit, but that they draw it to the attention of friends who will benefit from it as well.

Genesis of Neo-Modernism

1: THE "FOUNDING FATHERS"

PHILIP TROWER

MANY Catholics, one finds, react to the events in the Church over the last 15 years as though a rock had dropped out of the sky with nowhere for it to have fallen from—not even a passing jumbo jet.

What could possibly have caused such an explosion of anger, rebellion, heresy, apostasy and hatred of all things Catholic? It is as though the order of nature had been turned upside down: effects without causes; explosions without explosives or anyone to ignite them.

Underlying these feelings there is usually the belief that Catholic life before the Council was — leaving aside the usual short-comings—"in a pretty good state". Any defects there may have been were certainly not serious enough to account for subsequent calamities and disorders.

This belief is, I am sure, mistaken and only increases unhappiness and bewilderment.

Turning back to the time before the Council, I think we can now see more clearly than was possible earlier the two principal evils. An understanding of them will possibly help to make clearer why an apostasy is taking place simultaneously with an attempted movement of reform.

These two evils, I would say, were a tremendous decline in spiritual vitality among the faithful of all ranks, clerical and lay (i.e. ourselves), masked by a grand-looking *facade* of religious practice—I do not see how the present rebellion could have happened were this not so : and the spread of heresy, or of ideas tending toward heresy among a much wider section of the higher clergy than anyone had realized.

By higher clergy I do not mean cardinals and bishops, but theologians, scholars, thinkers, and teachers at Catholic universities and institutes of higher studies; the Catholic intelligentsia, in fact, at its top level. It is this second factor I want to talk about here.

What had been going on in this world of the higher clergy for the last 100 years? Why did most of this rampart of Jerusalem so tragically collapse in heaps of rubble when the modern world marched around it and blew its trumpets?

However, first of all a few words of a general kind about the place of learning and scholarship in the Church.

Treading a Narrow Path

Any Catholic who devotes his talents to expounding the Faith, or engages in study which will result in making the Church and its teachings better understood, is plainly doing a noble work. One has only to recall the immense good achieved by faithful Catholic scholars and theologians to feel grateful to God for their gifts which made the books possible and to the men themselves for having used those gifts so well.

While the chief work of Catholic scholars of this kind is to explain and defend Revelation and any truths that bear on it, they have a subordinate but connected work which is also very important : to investigate the new ideas which men are always propounding, inside and outside the Church, in order to separate what is true from what is false, and to see how exactly the elements of truth harmonize with Revelation.

This is probably the most difficult part of their work. The world of speculative ideas and massive accumulations of fact is the place where it is easiest to take a wrong path and fall into a pit, and they are frequently investigating new territory.

First among the pitfalls, I think, in the inclination of experts to fall in love with their subjects. For the Catholic student of Buddhism, Buddhism, and Buddhists start to rank highest in his heart; the same will be true of the student of the Stone Age or Marxism. (The archaeologist Sir Leonard Cottrell, commenting on this weakness, remarks good-humoredly that he had known Assyriologists who found even the ancient Assyrians, as depicted on their bas-reliefs, handsome.) When this happens, "my subject" becomes the interest which gives zest to life, and the Faith is seen as a boring extra. The consequences are especially damaging if the scholar is a priest. There will also be an urge to make "my subject" and the Faith look as much alike as possible.

Equally, learning itself or the intellectual life can become the great love—a kind of alternative and higher religion—and the fellow intellectual, even if atheist, seems spiritually closer than the main body of the faithful.

It is strange, when one considers it, that Catholics are not taught to think more about what might be called the Church Learned, and that there are not special orders of contemplatives to pray and do penance for its welfare, since its work is so necessary and its members occupy what, in regard to faith, is one of the most exposed positions in the Church. They are like men in an observation post continually under heavy shellfire. As they study new books and learned publications they live under a barrage of temptations of a kind most of the faithful never experience.

"Oh, what a brilliant idea. But what happens to the doctrine of grace? Perhaps I should pray before reading any more. No I haven't time. It's more important to get on with my work. *Laborare est orare*. The Church could be wrong; it's never been defined. How could a stupid bishop understand such complicated ideas."

The chief danger is not so much that they will take a wrong path—anyone can make mistakes—but that having

taken it they will insist in pressing ahead along it in spite of warnings.

Humility of Submission

For Catholic scholars, their unfailing protection, as we know, is obedience to the Church's teaching authority and readiness to submit their conclusions to its judgment. Provided they are willing to do this, and recognize that in spite of their intelligence and learning they are not the final authorities in matters of belief, or in deciding how far and in what way any particular branch of research that touches on faith and morals is to be carried out, they are safe.

Part of the mystery of the Church is that God in designing it and arranging how His truth is to be handed on, made Greek philosophers, or anyone resembling them, subordinate to Galilean fishermen. The three Wise Men bowing before Divine Wisdom made visible as a baby provided a prototype. A Pope or a bishop may be personally learned, but his learning does not add anything to his authority. His authority to pass judgment on the ideas of even the most brilliant thinker comes solely from the fact that he is a successor of one of Our Lord's working-class and little-educated apostles. (St. Paul, the "university graduate", was brought in later, but only after a big dose of humiliation.)

The purpose behind this plan is not difficult to see. Everything in God's designs is directed towards keeping us small in our own esteem, since this is the only way into the Kingdom of Heaven, and no one needs help in this matter more than men and women with intellectual gifts. Over the entrance of every Catholic university could well be carved the words of St. Therese of Lisieux: "God has no need of any human instrument, least of all me.") But this is an arrangement which the clever do not naturally find easy to accept. With faith they do; but as faith declines, it begins to stick in the throat. Then instead of seeing themselves as servants of Christ and His Mystical Body, without realizing it they become servants of this-worldly powers—as Occam did when he fled from Avignon to the court of Louis of Bavaria—or of their own careers.

One of the most unattractive aspects of the theologians who have made names for themselves since the Council is, I think, their callous vanity and selfishness. Their infidelity is, of course, worse, but it is not so instantly repulsive. The confusion and bewilderment into which they have plunged the lowly and simple, the vast numbers they have caused to abandon belief altogether, plainly leave them cold; as long as they can write what they please and make reputations for themselves, nothing apparently troubles them. If doctors had behaved like this, leaving behind a trail of corpses and invalids, they would have earned not reputations but infamy.

But then the revolutionary theologians do not accept God's plan for the Church. The world having entered the age of the expert, they believe the scholar or theologian must occupy in the Church the same place the scientist expects eventually to occupy in secular society—running it. This is the great dream and delusion of the revolutionary theologians; also, incidentally, of scientists and secular intellectuals. Real intellectuals almost never rule—except briefly in periods of disaster and chaos. The very nature of their gifts incapacitates them for it. Thinkers who are also natural rulers, like Calvin and Lenin, are rarities (thanks be to God) and the world usually sighs with relief when they are taken away.

The Truths Must Remain Intact

A second fact which the learned in the Church are tempted to lose sight of is that Revelation is unlike other kinds of knowledge; that being a body of truth coming directly from God, complete and absolutely certain, it has to be kept intact. It is not a naturally acquired pile of information, continually being added to and repeatedly having to be picked over so that any errors which have crept in can be thrown out. (The meaning of the development of doctrine and periodical renewals of theology—those much abused subjects—cannot be discussed here, but they do not alter what I have just said.) This is why Catholic theologians and scholars cannot enjoy the academic freedom claimed by scholars who deal in purely natural things, however much they may long for it.

On this point the Catholic scholar is exposed to another temptation; not pride or selfishness this time but fear of his non-Catholic colleagues; of the raised eyebrow, the amused little laugh at the learned meeting or in the university commonroom. "Oh, I apologize, Father, I was forgetting you have to ask the Pope's permission before you agree to that. . ." Father, instead of answering that he is happy to submit his ideas on any subject touching faith and morals to the Pope, since if God has made a revelation it obviously has to be protected from the vagaries of human opinion, wilts interiorly. Why should he have to take into account a lot of Italians in Rome who know nothing about science? What a burden it is having to cart the Faith around with one in these civilized academic surroundings, like a shabby old trunk filled with worn out clothes.

If Catholic scholars are to remain faithful today they are going to need an extra strong formation in detachment from human respect.

Revelation differs from other kinds of knowledge in a further fashion. In secular studies, intelligence and hard work are mostly sufficient. Defects of character and lack of belief are certainly not without consequences. Freud's atheism and imperiousness, for instance, evidently blinded him to much that would have seemed obvious to a different kind of man. Nevertheless, natural gifts and qualities alone can achieve striking results. But for the study and proper understanding of Catholic theology, Holy Scripture, and Church history other things are necessary.

Faith is Needed

First, to understand one must believe. Unbelieving historians who study the Church know far more about its theology and life than most Catholics do, but in a deep sense they do not understand what they know. The same begins to be true of Catholic scholars when doubts set in.

However, belief alone is not enough: with faith and learning there must be goodness. A Catholic scholar who allows himself to become dried up, ambitious, cynical, or selfish, something which very easily happens to scholars, will only have a shallow understanding of his subject. When Catholic theologians and scholars go a stage further and

think that mastery of their subject depends on their intellectual skill rather than on grace, they will start to become blind. An exceedingly lofty opinion of himself as a scholar seems to have been what carried Dollinger out of the Church and made Lord Acton a very restive member within it. Historically, the learned and clever have generally been the first to be taken in by new errors. At the beginning of this century, when a well-known priest, who later left the Church, started to preach heresy at a famous church in London, the first person to notice was a lay brother—one of those who did the housework. The learned fathers who spent all day reading books were slower to understand.

These remarks about the temptations and natural difficulties which beset Catholic scholars are made so as to set what I am about to say about a particular group of them in the proper context. No doubt most of the remarks are fairly obvious, but without them in mind it will be much less easy to understand why this century has seen a great rebellion of scholars and theologians. In these disasters, the causes are always moral and spiritual before they are intellectual.

The Germ of Modernism

Catholics, as we know, are always being influenced by ideas coming from outside the Church, a proportion of which are harmful. When spiritual health is strong, the Catholic Body throws them off; when a bit run down, will be invaded by them; when weak, will succumb in its faith to a whole range of infections.

Something like this began to happen in the middle of the last century—a process now reaching its climax.

Around 1860, the Catholic learned world began to feel fully for the first time the impact of that extensive thing, modern thought, which I talked about in another article. Dazzled by the prestige of 19th century science and scholarship (which were indeed formidable) and the technical marvels (gas lighting and steam engines) that went with them, they began accepting a whole range of speculative ideas and ideologies as established truths and altering Catholic belief to fit them.

Their original intention was apostolic : to detach all that was acceptable in modern thought and show how it could be harmonized with Catholic belief so that no unnecessary obstacles would prevent the men of their age from seeing Christ in the Catholic Church and the faithful themselves could not uselessly oppose what was naturally good. The heat in modern thought had to be separated from the chaff—a praiseworthy intention. This is the idea behind all true concepts of what Pope John meant by *aggiornamento*.

But one can already see the seeds of trouble in the way they mostly spoke about the work to be done.

The Church, it was said, must be reconciled with modern times” or “the spirit of the age,” Gioberti (d. 1852) being one of the earliest to make the demand. But what is the spirit of the age? How much can we make friends with it? Insofar as its ideas are wrong, can it be persuaded to give them up, and if it won't, how far can we safely collaborate with it? These, of course, are the questions Jacques Maritain spent much of his life wrestling with, and that underlay some of the struggles at the Council over the drafting of its documents.

If the age is thought of as being run by a variety of spirits, an anarchical oligarchy so to speak, the problem is less intractable. Catholics can make friends with the good ones and shun or shut the door on the bad. In this sense, the Church is always reconciling herself with modern times—there are no times that are not modern—which often means tolerating what she does not approve of, but cannot remedy; the best she may be able to do is mitigate the most serious evils. In this she will often be hampered by the fact that a proportion of her children will be conducting a false *aggiornamento* with the times, a kind of impassioned love affair—the Renaissance and feudal periods providing us with some striking examples—the consequences of which will later cost holy churchmen much time and effort to undo. (Those of the 21st century are plainly going to have a big job of this sort.)

To some extent the disputes over this matter have to do with differences of taste and emphasis: “Do modern times have more of good than bad in them, or bad than good?”

But one already sees in men like Gioberti an inclination, which will become more pronounced in succeeding generations of Catholics, to regard "modern times" or the "spirit of the age" as an indivisible whole, good in itself, which can only be either accepted or rejected. This is much too simple an approach for a Catholic. Modern times—if by that we mean the ideas and forces let loose by the 18th-century enlightenment and the industrial revolution—are characterized by remarkable technical and material achievements, some reasonable and even noble aspirations, but also, obviously, by profound philosophical and spiritual errors—the unwillingness of men to see themselves as creatures being the most notable.

Becoming Enlightened

Another way of considering the work to be done was to talk about bringing together faith and science, or faith and reason. This way of speaking too was not without the seeds of misunderstanding. One knows what it meant. A naturally established fact, if it really is a fact, remains a fact. Our religion does not require us to deny it. But it may be a long time before the import of a particular fact is understood, and the mysteries God has revealed to us often seem to be contradicted by natural facts and appearances. When we speak about bringing together faith with reason or science, what is in our minds? Is our object in reality to make the mysteries revealed by God appear what is considered to be "reasonable" by the average man or scientist without belief?

There would, I think, have been much less misunderstanding on this subject if instead of talking about faith and reason, Catholics had always talked about supernatural and natural knowledge. What was at stake would then have been seen more clearly: two sources of information and two bodies of knowledge, the first being the more precious and allowing the mind to penetrate deeper into reality. The objection to talking about faith and reason, or faith and science, is that it immediately puts faith at a disadvantage. Faith is widely regarded as a matter of hazy feelings and vague wishes, while reason and science are

considered clear and precise and to deal only with facts. The advantage thus goes to "reason" and "science"—whether thought of as representing the claims of natural knowledge or the unbelieving point of view—before any discussion of the problems arising from trying to harmonize the two kinds of knowledge has so much as started.

By the 1870s, the learned Catholics I am talking about had begun trying to make faith, or supernatural knowledge, look "reasonable" to their unbelieving contemporaries in just the way I have been describing; a certain sign that it had begun to look "unreasonable" that is to say, unbelievable, to themselves. Under the influence of their studies, or rather of the temptations that went along with them, faith collapsed. The voice of secular learning, even religion, came to seem a higher authority than the voice of the Church, and they took it as a principle that in any conflict of ideas (real or apparent) the Church must give way and adjust her thinking. Instead of separating wheat from chaff, having acquired a preference for chaff, they started trying to smuggle wheat *and* chaff into the granaries of the Church.

This was the origin of Modernism, and the intellectual subordination of the Church to secular learning its foundation stone. At the end of this process—which is now being reached—all of Revelation has been cast aside as a fairy story which men invented to explain things before they could think, and "science" and "modern thought", accepted in their totality as the only source of knowledge, are woven into a religion. We are watching a bit of genuine evolution—the transformation of one kind of creature into another. When complete, the Christian steps forth, a Christian no longer, but a full-fledged man of the enlightenment.

The Hub of the Modernist Wheel

Modernism in its first phase ran from about 1875 to 1910, when, as will be recalled, it was stopped, or was thought to have been, by St. Pius X. It then went underground for 50 years and resurfaced with the death of Pius XII. In this first period the movement was confined to the well-educated; the mass of the faithful were little affected.

What came about was one of those intellectual brotherhoods of like-minded men which seem to arise spontaneously; men who are reading the same books and therefore thinking the same thoughts and who either know each other personally or by correspondence.

Between 1888 and 1900, a proportion of them gathered in a series of "international scientific congresses" of Catholics (they were principally gatherings of historians, Scripture scholars and philosophers) arranged by Msgr. d'Hulst, rector of the *Institut Catholique* in Paris, an institute of Catholic higher studies recently founded to provide scholars who could answer the attacks being made in the name of learning and science on the grounds for belief.

The most active figure was Baron von Hugel, a naturalized Englishman, Austrian by birth, who lived most of his later life at Cambridge in England. He was a kind of religious busybody, highly cultivated and widely read, who devoted himself to putting priests and laymen with doubtful ideas in touch with each other, encouraging them to persist in their work when they showed signs of flagging, and generally trying to keep them together as a group. He lived until 1925 and has had a great reputation among English Catholics, those in the know having minimized his Modernism and the rest being unaware of it. It is difficult to know what at various times he believed, but by 1900, it does not seem to have been the Catholic Faith. Fr. Tyrrel, himself a Modernist, after listening to von Hugel talking about religion one evening, summed up von Hugel's opinions thus: "Nothing is true, but the sum total of nothings is sublime." The estimate is, I think, confirmed by the testimony of other contemporaries. In spite of this, he was rather conspicuously pious—to the surprise of his more logical French friends. He much enjoyed acting as spiritual guide to troubled souls, sometimes assuring Protestants that it was better for them not to become Catholics. Much of his other advice is perfectly sound since he was familiar with the great masters of the spiritual life. The misunderstandings about him are largely due, I think, to his strange, bland, and one is tempted to say, slippery psychology. Like other Modernists of this period, he had the uncanny knack of writing as if he had a split personality, sometimes sound-

ng like a devout and rather exceptionally spiritual monk or contemplative nun, at others like the editor of a magazine for sceptics. Teilhard de Chardin also had this knack.

Von Hugel certainly did not create Modernism, but his knowledge of languages, social position, and financial independence enabled him to act as impresario for the movement in a way that would not have been easy for anyone else. He thus gave it a coherence it might not otherwise have had without which the public measures taken by St. Pius X to put an end to the movement might not have been necessary.

Spokes Connected to the Hub

Among von Hugel's Modernist correspondents, less than a dozen figure prominently in studies of the movement.

Loisy, the Scripture scholar, is perhaps the best known. He lectured at the *Institut Catholique* and wrote a series of books during the nineties and just after, which seemed to be a defense of the New Testament against ideas like those of the German scholar Harnack, but actually undermined it. Laberthonniere, an Oratorian priest, and Leroy, a layman, were philosophers. Herbert was head of the *Ecole Fenelon* in Paris a well-known boy's college; his interests also were chiefly philosophic, though they extended to the *Bible* and history too. Houtin, another priest, was a kind of self-appointed publicist for the movement, and the liberal Protestant writer, Paul Sabatier, an enthusiastic participant. This was the main French contingent. The Italians Minocchi, Buonaiuti, Semaria, and Fozzarro were the principal agents in popularizing Modernist ideas in Italy. The first three were priests. Minocchi and Buonaiuti edited reviews. Semaria, a Barnabite, was a Scripture scholar like Loisy. Fogazarro, the successful novelist, was able to bring Modernist ideas before the general reading public. In England, Fr. Tyrrel, Irish by birth and upbringing and a convert, was the most openly enthusiastic Modernist—in the view of his friends a mystical thinker and reformer of the philosophy of religion. Both he and Loisy had in them something of the *enfant terrible*—the urge to attract attention and make a splash—to the embarrassment of their more adult and prudent associates.

These were the men who made a noise; who were prepared to say openly what others were only thinking, or to take to their limits and beyond, ideas which these others were only gingerly beginning to touch, and who, therefore eventually got themselves ex-communicated, left the Church of their own accord, had books censored, or were forbidden to write. However, they were no more the cause of Modernism than von Hugel was. They were merely symptoms of a wider and deeper disorder—the tip of the rock showing above the waves at high tide.

Finally, Msgr. Mignot, the French Archbishop of Albi was a cautious episcopal patron for the circle.

Grander and more worldly wise figures like the French philosopher Blondel were sympathetic and played a part in the movement, but drew back from the extreme consequences of Modernist ideas. Others like Edmund Bishop, the English liturgical scholar, layman and convert, only expressed their views in private letters and otherwise laid low. Abbe Bremond, the historian of French seventeenth century spirituality, another of the *enfant terrible* type, darted in and out of the game but mostly ran up and down the touch line, thus keeping out of serious trouble; while the French scholar Msgr. Duchesne could be said to have sat in the grandstand and enjoyed the sport without getting sunburnt or wet, sometimes egging a man on, at others crying a warning.

Duchesne, a hard enigmatic and intellectually worldly priest, was first at the *Institut Catholique* and then, for the last 20 years of his life, at the French school in Rome. While unquestionably learned, with a detailed knowledge of early Church history, he appears to have had little comprehension of what the Church actually is. His feelings for the Holy See seem to have been sardonic contempt. Herbert said Duchesne helped him to see the “reasons” for not believing in the Resurrection. Duchesne later denied this. On his instructions his papers were burned after his death. The letters that survive make chilling reading.

Here is one to Herbert urging him not to give up the headship of the *Ecole Fenelon*, although Duchesne had good reason to believe he had lost the Faith.

"Religious authority counts on its traditions and the most devoted members of its personnel, who are also the least intelligent. What can be done? . . . Endeavour to reform it? The only outcome of such attempts would be to get oneself thrown out the window. . .

"Let us, then, teach what the Church teaches. . . We need not deny that in all this there is a large part of symbolism that calls for explanation. But leave the explanation to make its own way privately.

"It may be that despite all appearances, the old ecclesiastical edifice is going one day to tumble down. . . Should this happen, no one will blame us for having supported the old building for as long as possible."

I have quoted this letter for two reasons. First because although Duchesne had some volumes put on the Index, he has an impeccable reputation as a great Catholic scholar; secondly because he illustrates what I was saying earlier about the temptations of scholarship and about what happens when Faith, Hope, and Charity decline behind a pile of learned books. What we see is something pretty sad and ugly. Behind how many other piles of books was the same decay taking place? Duchesne multiplied by several hundred would provide enough explosives to set off several revolutions.

Listening to the group of unquestionable Modernists we have just been considering was an ever-widening audience of sympathizers, whose hearts were troubled by the same questionings and whose thoughts were moving in the same direction.

(To be continued)

GENESIS OF MODERNISM

The above article and the 4 to come are available now in pamphlet form, under the title of "The Church Learned and the Revolt of the Scholars" at £1.35 or \$2.70, post-free from St. Duthac's Book Service, 39, Blenheim Park Road, South Croydon, Surrey, U.K.

Bishop Stewart of Sandhurst, Australia has for long provided his fellow bishops throughout the world with a magnificent example of plain and courageous speaking in defence of perennial truth. Few have shown themselves willing to follow it; but that is another story. Here, we give readers his thoughts on abortion and kindred vices in a Lenten Pastoral he wrote earlier this year.

Breakdown of Christian Values

RT. REV. BERNARD STEWART

THE root cause of today's malaise and near despair is the general break-down of the moral order, following man's retreat from God. We have the absurd spectacle of man self-sufficient and arbiter of his own destiny, untrammelled in choice of conduct. God is outlawed in His own Creation, with some Nations proclaiming Atheism as their creed. Others acknowledge Him with a condescending nod and at the same time disregard His divine Laws relative to human beings and human rights. Therein germinates the seed of race suicide. The breakdown of Christian values becomes more and more apparent as the human race, possessed by its own created demons, rushes blindly down the Gaderene slope to its own engulfment. This particularly applies in regard to life itself.

Perhaps, this is most vividly pin-pointed in the naming of 1979 as the Year of the Child, while war on the child was never so blatant, so cruel and so ferocious. If the Year of the Child really means anything, the first priority should be the wiping out of the hideous crime of abortion—mass murder on a scale that outnumbers even the horrendous killings of this century in senseless wars, in genocides, and in ever-increasing violent deaths. Enshrined in statute books, in constitutional interpretation by judiciaries, in

accommodating legal judgment and in the conniving of parliamentarians, this disgusting and degrading traffic in human flesh assumes respectability in our decadent society.

Meanwhile, there is great cry and stir over other human rights which rings hollowly in the climate of child-murder tolerance. By all means let us protect the child from the horrible crimes of bashing; of prostitution; from the preying of perverts, but these, though grossly evil, still do not measure against the slaughter of the defenceless innocent of the womb—betrayed by their procreators, executed by those pledged to save life and sometimes their pitiful remains sold for sordid gain to the ghoulish jackals that follow the kill.

We are asked to fund this crime against God and our own very existence as a Nation, and in parliamentary debate our representatives will be called upon to decide this added injustice. To stand idly by and not protest is part connivance, indicates a cowardly indifference, and encourages those who abet this foul and fell slaughter.

What has this to do with us in this time of Lent? First and foremost, it is a heinous sin against God—the rejection and destruction of the precious gift of life itself—the good from which all other goods spring. This gift is in time and for eternity; for, in every conception, the principle of life is a human soul. God specially created it in His own Image and for Himself—great beyond all other earthly works of His hand and a little less than the angels.

Lent is all about Sin, the wrecker of man in the beginning and in its subsequent following by the sons and daughters of Adam—the loss of sharing in the Divine life, that comes with Baptism; the consequences in further darkness of mind and weakness of will already inherited and the final result eternal separation from God, if unrepented.

We must not rest contented with our own personal need for penance and prayer, but we must look out on a world increasingly alienated from God and plunging ever more deeply into the mire and morass of human degradation. The worst sins, pilloried so trenchantly by the great St. Paul, are with us. Let us hear them and measure them against what we see and hear in our humanistic, hedonistic, sex-obsessed age :

"Who changed the truth of God into a lie and worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed forever. For this cause, God delivered them up to shameful affections. For their women have changed the natural use into that use which is against nature. And, in like manner, the men also, leaving the natural use of the women, have burned in their lusts, one towards another; men with men, working that which is filthy and receiving in themselves the recompense which was due to their error."

Let us not be deceived and deluded by the new breed of prophets who label virtue as vice and give euphemistic names to the basest infringements of God's eternal laws. In many instances it is the mis-naming of lust as love, with mere children and teenagers being sold pornographic caricatures of the sacred relationship of man and woman and obscenities that stimulate passion and ultimately destroy that modesty and chastity which protect and prepare them for their true dignity as partners with God in the Sacrament of Marriage and its fecundity.

The ancient message remains and the record of history attests: "Do Penance or you will all likewise perish". Christ took upon Himself the burden of us all; "He was bruised for our iniquities, He was wounded for our sins". During Lent we must add our prayers and penances to His in His great act of Atonement on the Cross, asking pardon for our own offending and for all those who are, like us, needful of the Blood of the "Lamb of God, Who takes away the sins of the world". We are our brother's keeper.

We welcome this view from a Catholic layman of events within the Church today. We will be happy to have further contributions from those of the laity who would like to submit them for publication. We agree particularly with one of the Author's main points in his article, that contemporary renewalists within the Church are not only out of touch with the mass of the Church's layfolk; but apparently, content to remain so.

Is Internal Reconciliation Unthinkable ?

A LAYMAN'S VIEW

J. C. L. INMAN

INCREASINGLY with the passage of time, as I read and try to comprehend some of the writings of the advocates of causes in the contemporary Church, a sense of unreality descends on me. In the wake and name of a Pastoral Council, speculations and unsubstantiated claims abound as to what the people of God want, need and should have imposed on them for their progress and benefit. And yet, there seems to be a coy reluctance to risk consulting the people, confidentially conducting "in-depth tests" with them before imposing "reforms" as *fait accompli*, or being seen to heed the actual as opposed to the anticipated results of "renewal". It is as if the theory was all, the facts an irrelevance.

Reaction to a Lay Initiative

When a lay initiative—the *Catholic Herald* Gallup Poll of 1977—did attempt a confidential consultation of Catholics in what is probably one of the least disordered parts of the Church's vineyard in the free, developed world, it showed a situation of disunity. Real differences existed at

the predominantly mute, not publicly protesting parishioner level, which should have given Authority much food for thought. The poll proved that Mass attendance and general passivity cannot be equated with willing assent to, let alone a joyous acceptance of the content of contemporary changes within the Church or the thinking behind them.

The most devastating revelation was that the new liturgy, the main contact point of Catholics with their religion, completely satisfied only one-third of regular church-goers, a figure that the astonished Secretary of the National Liturgical Commission honestly faced up to. However, in tune with the over-cerebral, rationalistic contemporary approach to religion, he concluded that the remedy for this deplorable situation was didactic: the laity must be more effectively instructed, if need be by retrained teachers. The possibility that the people, functioning in the manner of a jury, had given a majority "not proven" verdict against the imposition of the vernacular-all-participatory New Mass, as the only form regularly available to the vast majority of them, was clearly not considered as even remotely admissible evidence.

The Church at the Council

So much in the pastoral and psychological approach to renewal seems unsound. Pope John calls a Council, not because of a crisis, a major heresy emerging or because the Church was in demonstrable decline. He believed himself to be inspired to hold a review, to refurbish where practicable in the light of changed circumstances since Vatican I, without for one second intending an assault on the tradition or doctrine of incontestably the largest Church in the world, which he praised in 1962 for its vigour, strength and unity. The people mostly welcomed the idea, feeling in an imprecise way that it "must be a good thing".

Like most of the bishops arriving for the Council, Pope John was open-minded, but radical elements in the Church (initially, mainly European bishops under the —I believe— vastly excessive influence of long-suppressed, high-powered "Thinkers" of more revolutionary inclination) saw their chance. They arrived organised, prepared and determined; unlike the majority, who thought they were coming to a

fairly brief fraternal gathering and, indeed, had little idea of what they were expected to do. Because of this disorganisation and the very human wish not to be type-cast as being against "progress", immobile and unecumenical, too many of the unprepared fathers were swept along on the radical tide. The media were much in evidence, wanting excitement and change: so the bandwagon rolled on inexorably. Despite periodic interventions by the radically-inclined Pope Paul to curb gross excesses—these interventions being bitterly resented by the reformers—a revolution was devised, sanctioned and implemented. Ambiguous Council Acta were left for post-conciliar "interpretation" and "development" by advisory commissions dominated by progressives and, hey presto, we had a bold, new Church.

The ease with which their *coup* had been achieved astonished the radicals, even if it did not begin to go far enough for their still frustrated experts, the inherent frustrations of whom can only be relieved when they die. However, enough of their theories had been accepted to be going on with; there was time for further "progress" on the foundations now laid. Pandora's box could now be opened to the expectant laity, who were thought to be cheering lustily on the sidelines, with their tradition of obedience, needless to say, unchanged; and eager to learn from their also cheering mentors, the parochial clergy. The Old Church was dead, long live the New. Now we'll show them; there will be real growth in every respect by which the Church is judged. The few casualties will be among those who are a hindrance anyway. Numerically, they will be swamped by the converts, once people "understand" the significance of the Church of "Progressive Thinking Man".

Both during and after the Council the people were taken for granted. Despite the fathers and the experts knowing that literacy was now extensive and many developed countries democratic, it was assumed that the reformers knew and were in touch with the people, who would pray, pay and do what they were told as hitherto, only with far more fervour. The sheep would fatten wondrously on their reseeded pastures.

All revolutions produce their slogans and catchwords, and ours is full of them. Surprisingly "consultation" is one,

despite the great care taken in practise to restrict it to the upper echelons during the formulatory stages of "renewal". Other examples, used both between experts and in sales-promotion talk to consumers, are "greater involvement", "participation", "meaningfulness", "new conceptualisations" and "insights" (often very tired and much condemned heresies), "relevance to contemporary society", "reconciliation", "divisiveness", the "Caring Church" (what a gratuitous insult that one is to those who served in the vastly more successful Church of the past !), "openness" and so on. As the heading of this piece indicates, the one I want to look at is "reconciliation".

Confession : Old Style and New

My pre- and post-conciliar belief is that Judas could have sought reconciliation, forgiveness, while the halter choked him. Only God knows. But, over nearly two millennia, the Church developed the Sacrament of Penance on the basis of confession, judgement, the giving and accepting of a punishment followed by absolution. While one might and did go to see a priest for help and advice and by doing so confess and be absolved in a face-to-face meeting, the norm was impersonal and unseen confession to the unseen God's priest. Both human parties to the Sacrament were fully aware of the third, Divine Party's love for humanity and especially for the penitent; but, in the divine sense the word love involved more than our contemporary ideas about benevolence, human cares, affections and sexuality. God's love was also demanding and hard; crosses were to be taken up; there was an exterior darkness into which one could be cast; there were no cosy soft options.

Contemporary life (and "thinking"!) is excessively humanistic. In the Church, disciplines have been eased in conformity. (Maybe a psychologist will explain why the harder military outfits like the Guards, Marine Commandos and S.A.S. never had or have recruiting problems ?) Reason, instruction and knowledge are emphasised more than blind faith and a healthy element of awe of God. I believe it is very healthy to be in awe of God. Be that as it may, the Sacrament of Penance has had its image (even if not its substance) changed to accommodate modern

thinking. While, for the moment, one has the choice of face-to-face or invisible communication with the priest, the implication of this familiar gradualistic approach, introduced as an option (like Communion in the hand or tongue) is that face-to-face confrontation is the new—and therefore better—and coming mode. No more roastings from behind the grille for serious sins; the sensibilities and sensitivities of both human parties helped by it. Sin anyway has become a rarely mentioned word, almost a dirty word in an era where there is little black and white, only the grey fog of failures in “loving” relationships.

This new approach to Confession does of course create its own problems. It is clearly too hard, too off-putting, demanding and embarrassing a procedure for, say, the lapsed or those who have made rather a bad mess of some loving relationship or other. The old Judas box did cater for them, but that really must be phased out. It smacks of furtiveness; it is anachronistic and patently inferior. The answer is simple—general absolution at Mass to cater for all needs and save time for a diminishing number of clergy. The venial sinner can talk to the priest, the mortal sinner direct to his Maker: thus all can become reconciled in a manner fitted to Modern Man.

Reconciliation and Ecumenism

The word “reconciliation” is worked overtime in the ecumenical field. The divisions of Christendom, over 600 recognised “Christian” bodies in the U.K. alone, are rightly called a scandal, one that all should gladly work to eliminate. But there are grave risks involved in this work. “Progressive Thinking Man”, with his penchant for rapid results, his suave erudition and preference for the soft option, may find formulae of words to cut corners to his own intellectual satisfaction, even if they fail to satisfy humble folk who just believe or the tougher customers who are unimpressed by impatience and imprecision. A sense of the desirability of “togetherness” must not lead to ditching or accommodating doctrine: an imprecise “uplift” at an interdenominational charismatic meeting, where gibberish is uttered in the cause of “speaking in tongues” is probably the result of hallucination. I was impressed by

two clear-headed or -hearted comments on the *Agreed Statements* into which so much sincere effort has been poured. On "Windsor", on the Eucharist, by two Catholics: "Agreement about fog by fog". When I read it through for the first time I could find in it nothing to which anyone could take exception; but, on reading it through again, I realised that it was omissive on the key question "Who did what and how"? On "Canterbury", from a sporting parson acquaintance out shooting: "I might shoot you rather than a hare if it ran between us, if you insisted that I am a sacrificing priest". Work and pray for Christian reunion, for reconciliation but, if we are still in communion with Peter, let us not be confused as to which foundation is on rock, and which is on sand.

Reconciliation between Catholics

If "reconciliation" is deemed to mean both forgiveness and reunion, is there not a need for reconciliation among those who profess to be Roman Catholics? If, for the moment, we forget the brilliant but heterodox "Thinkers" who really should, if they are taken at their written words, seek their salvation outside the Church, there is a great need for reunion, for internal reconciliation, for the restoration of order among the main body of the Faithful. Is submission or reconciliation the name of the game? Have or have not mistakes been made by both "sides" in our disputes? Will or will not "progressives" accept that "traditionalists" have some justification and vice versa? Have we the will, do we in our hearts (emotions are regarded as very unreliable by "Thinking Man") want reconciliation or surrender? Certainly, as one who is far from being a total traditionalist, whose best label is that of "Disillusioned Radical", I do not see the proverbial snowball's chance in hell of truly healing divisions elsewhere, if we cannot heal our own.

Reconciliation and the Liturgy

As aforesaid, the liturgy is the main lifelong contact-point of most Catholics with their religion, and reconciliation here could heal many wounds. As my personal disillusion with change developed during a lengthy period of trying to adjust to and learn to live with it, I was initially amazed

that many estimable bishops and priests appeared to have developed a near detestation of both Latin and the Mass they were ordained to celebrate. However, study and a closer experience of this seemingly weird phenomenon showed that it was not the Old Mass or Latin that was detested. It was, very humanly, their reaction to the resistance of the previously docile among their flocks to that which had been imposed by "Rome". I feel it should be said here that "Progressive Thinking Man" cannot claim that the people originated the demand for liturgical reform: pre-conciliar protest about the liturgy was marked by its absence outside the circles of a few restless intellectuals.

The breadth, depth and persistence of liturgical protest and unfulfilment is taken, not as an example of easy witness, but as an affront to those who have had to implement "renewal". And yet, are we not supposed to be more involved these days, did not the Council desire less muteness, less drifting along in a rut, more openness between the top, middle and bottom? Liturgically the Council proscribed (banned) absolutely nothing, speaking of existing rites with respect and prescribing (ordering) that they should be fostered and retained. It prescribed the retention of Latin in parallel with the vernacular in the New Rite. It would seem that the "Spirit" that passed the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy wanted variety, in recognition of the response to varied needs; needs that have been proved in practise by the failure of the mode in which the New Mass is celebrated to satisfy and edify so many of the Faithful or to bring in the anticipated converts.

When I was young, I hoped that Mass would be short and I found it boring. Today my children hope it will be short and say it bores them: nothing has changed here! But I grew to love the Mass, not because of what I learned from its didactic elements, but because of a developing sense of awe for a loving, forgiving but demanding God: of reverence, worshipfulness, mystery, sometimes beauty of sight, sound and word; and possibly, above all, a feeling of community with the millions both long dead and as yet unborn, who had or would worship in the same way. There may have been an imbalance between my role as an individual worshipping God and my role as a member of a community at worship, but I never felt any sense of lack

of community : indeed, the spontaniety of greeting either on entering or leaving Church did more for me than today's enforced drill-motions do to express our solidarity. I do not merely wonder, but worry whether my children will grow to love the unmysterious, ever-noisy, banal Mass we have no option other than to attend today ? It all seems a sad result of so much human effort.

The catchword "divisive" is sometimes brought into use when the subject of liturgical parallelism is mentioned, as if we are not actually divided in our hearts already ! The then Mgr. Benelli, while in the Curia, said it was out of the question, because contrary to the new ecclesiology to restore the Old Mass in parallel with the New. In view of the devastations caused by this new ecclesiology and its total lack of proof of success, one might be forgiven for seeing the hand of the Holy Spirit in the election of Pope John Paul II, when the now Cardinal Benelli may have come within a couple of votes of election in the early stages of the second conclave of 1978.

A Question to Ask

I believe perversely that divisiveness is chiefly met higher up the tree than near the ground. The sympathy and charity of the laity for each other's problems, which are not of their causing, is extensive. I wonder what the result of a secret ballot would be to this question : "After nine years experience of the New Mass, considerable numbers remain unfulfilled by it and would like the Old Mass to be regularly celebrated as an option for them. Would you think it divisive, would you be offended if it was celebrated in this Church, say at the X o'clock Mass, all the other Masses continuing to be vernacular New Masses"?

Heaven forbid that the Church should become a democracy, but it exists for all; lay witnesses should not be ignored, there should be room for all; for internal reconciliation in charity, good sense and the much misapplied "Spirit of the Council".

HIGHLY RECOMMENDED

"John Henry Newman: Mary—the Second Eve".
Available at 35p or \$1.00 post-free from Sister E.
Breen, The Convent, Sandrock Hill, The Ridge,
Hastings, East Sussex TN34 2RD.

In the December, 1978, number of *Christian Order*, there appeared an article by Father Pedro Arrupe, General of the Society of Jesus, entitled "Marxism and Catechesis". It was, in fact, his address to the Synod of Bishops in Rome in October, 1977. On January 18th of this year, there appeared in an American Catholic Weekly, *The Wanderer*, the first of a series of four articles in criticism of what Father Arrup had written. The articles were by a free-lance journalist writing under the pseudonym of Wilton Westwell. Father Crane publishes below his reply to Mr. Westwell.

CURRENT COMMENT

Letter to a Free Lancer

THE EDITOR

Dear Mr. Westwell,

IN the issue of *Christian Order* for the month of December of last year, 1978, I published an article entitled "Marxism and Catechesis" by Father Pedro Arrupe, Superior General of the Society of Jesus, of which I am a member. The article, in fact, was the address presented by Father Arrupe to the Synod of Bishops, which met in Rome in October, 1977. It was published later in the *Osservatore Romano*, from which I took it. Incidentally, I note you criticize me for publishing it without comment. I suggest that, logically, you should do the same with the *Osservatore*, for it, too, published Father Arrupe's address without comment. I wonder why you did not do so. The question is relevant, the more so in view of the fact that the *Osservatore* reproduction was in print for several months before I published it in *Christian Order*. I wonder whether you were frightened of doing this. After all, the *Osservatore* is the Vatican's official paper. Or, maybe, you were afraid that the *Wanderer*, which carried your critique of Father

Arrupe's article, would not carry anything in criticism of the official Vatican organ, whereas *Christian Order* is a very different proposition; fair game, indeed, for anyone who might wish to pick a quarrel with it.

A Somewhat Inequitable Proceeding

Mind you, I have not the slightest objection to anything written in criticism of my periodical. On the contrary, I welcome criticism, provided it is soundly based and reasonably intelligent. Which brings me to my reason for replying to your critique of Father Arrupe's article. I would suggest, with respect, that it is neither fairly based nor reasonably intelligent. My reasons for this suggestion will be given in a moment. Before doing so, allow me to remark on a further point. It is that my attention was drawn to your first article in criticism of Father Arrupe long after it was published. I am a subscriber to the *Wanderer*. Your first article (January 18th) was brought to my notice by a reader of *Christian Order* round about the end of February. I received my copy of the *Wanderer* containing it in the first fortnight of March, if I remember rightly. Your second article (January 25th) reached me considerably later. Your third (February 22nd) arrived just before I set off on April 1st for a trip in connection with my work at Claver House to Bombay, Singapore, Dacca, and Rawalpindi. Thus I was given the opportunity of reading your three articles *together*; a thing I thought it essential to do in order that any reply I made might be balanced and fair. There was no time, however, before setting out on my trip, to compose a reasoned reply. I settled down to do this a couple of days after my return on April 29th. I had just begun this task when, lo and behold, there came to me on May 5th, nearly four months after the appearance of your first article, a copy of the *Wanderer* for March 1st, carrying your fourth article. It had taken more than two months to reach me. In view of the fact that the June/July number of *Christian Order* is in the press and the August/September number will not be published until the first week of September, I think you will agree that I am placed at some disadvantage in any reply I make to your article. I could have been spared this disadvantage had you or the Editor of the *Wanderer* taken it on yourselves to send me copies of the

Wanderer containing your articles by air mail. This however, you did not do. Inevitably, therefore, my reply to your critique is late; which means that the damage done by your articles has been allowed to run before there was a chance of my being able to halt it. The whole proceeding strikes me as somewhat inequitable. Neither can there be any doubt of the damage. I would not object if I had deserved it; but, in my opinion and as I hope to show you in the course of this article, it is quite undeserved because your critique misunderstands Father Arrupe's viewpoint with regard to Marxism as set out in his article in *Christian Order* and proceeds, in consequence, to misrepresent it. As I see it, what you have done in your critique is to set up a man of straw, which you then proceed to knock down. This is an easy game. It is not, however, a fair one. So far as I can see, you can be freed from the charge of unfairness only on the grounds of defective intelligence. It is for you, not me, to decide which it shall be. I am without any desire to engage in vituperation. Abuse is no substitute for reasoned argument of the sort that ought to prevail between Catholics.

As I see it, you appear as determined in your writing to fit Father Arrupe's views into your own preconceived categories of thought. In your case, I am sure, the process is largely subconscious and, therefore, without malice. But what you do, in fact, in your critique is to make Father Arrupe's words bear the interpretation you wish them to bear in order that you may condemn him for making them; whereas an objective study of his text will assure the unbiased reader that the meaning you plant on it is precisely the one it cannot realistically bear. What the Editor of the *Wanderer* ought to have done, I suggest, was to publish Father Arrupe's article side by side with the first in your series and with a caution to the reader that there were more to come from yourself. This way his readers would have been enabled to judge for themselves. This was not done. In the event, therefore, they had to be content with your summary of Father Arrupe's article.

Misrepresentation Based on Misunderstanding

The process of misrepresentation begins here, for what we get from you is not really a summary, but a biased

condensation of his words. This is achieved by the simple process of omitting a number of his article's cautionary and explanatory passages, to say nothing of others in condemnation of key aspects of the central Marxist thesis. In particular, there is a passage from the Apostolic Letter of the late Pope Paul VI, *Octogesima Adveniens*, of which your summary takes no note whatsoever. Interestingly enough and apart from anything else, the very fact that Father Arrupe cites this cautionary passage of Pope Paul is sufficient of itself to free him from the charge of falling victim to Marxist ideology, which you bring against him. You will understand me, therefore, when I say that I am not impressed by this omission. Be that as it may, my point, I hope, is clear. It is that the process of misinterpretation begins with what I would call your partisan summary of Father Arrupe's words. The reader is readied, thereby, for the condemnation that is to follow.

I am not suggesting for a moment that any kind of malice is responsible for what appears as your biased condensation of Father Arrupe's article. The bias emerges, rather, as the fruit I am afraid of ignorance which has led you to misunderstand what Father Arrupe is trying to do in his article and, in consequence, to misinterpret its message, however unwittingly, to readers. Let me be more specific. In his article the Jesuit General makes three points. The first stresses the need for a clear understanding of contemporary Marxism; the second, for clear discernment on the basis of such understanding so that, thirdly, on those occasions when Christians find themselves alongside Marxists in pursuit, say, of an immediate goal common to them both and demanded by justice, they will be enabled "to offer honest and open collaboration in the measure, and within the limits, of that which is accounted as truly the common good"; but also, at the same time, granted freedom by their understanding and discernment of Marxism itself "to denounce and keep one's distance when one's Christian conscience enjoins". This requires for the Christian a clear-headed knowledge of the intimate link which binds today's varied forms of Marxist expression to its central ideology, which no Christian may accept, and an equally clear understanding of the relationship that links varied aspects

of Marxist analysis with its central ideology. Interestingly enough, the passage in *Octogesima Adveniens* (34) in which Pope Paul calls for this clear-headed discernment on the part of Christians as essential, if they are to make use of Marxist analysis or co-operate with Marxists for the attainment of limited socio-political objectives, is the very passage which Father Arrupe cites in cautionary fashion at the outset of his article and of which you make no mention whatsoever in what I have described, fairly I think, as your biased condensation of his article. I find this omission disconcerting to say the least.

Call for a Clear Understanding of Marxism

Let me return to the first of the three points made by Father Arrupe in his article. In it, he calls for a clear understanding of contemporary Marxism. If catechetical or religious instruction today is to include, as it should, the political and social dimension of Christian living, then, he says, it should take account of Marxism which is being presented with increasing effect to the world today as offering an alternate and far more satisfactory way of life than that which obtains in the West. One of the main reasons, of course, why the Marxist recipe for living in general terms (as distinct from its concrete Stalinist expression in the Soviet Union) is finding increased favour today in western circles is that in former years religious and catechetical instruction within the Catholic Church did *not* take into account the political and social dimension of Christian living. This neglect was carried to the point where it can be stated quite fairly that the present empire of Communist success is in no small part the measure of Christian and Catholic deficiency in this regard. I can lay legitimate claim to know what I am talking about here, for I have been engaged in the field of what used to be called the Catholic Social Apostolate for the past thirty-five years. I speak from my own personal experience and that of others engaged in the same work. They will tell you as I am telling you now that, in our experience, within the broad field of Christian and Catholic Education at school and afterwards, the Social Teaching of the Church was rarely taken account of by the Church's Establishment at less than papal

level as a fit subject for serious discussion, educationally and otherwise. It was left to the efforts of a comparative few to make it known. In return for their efforts they received at the best a beneficent tolerance; at the worst, something not far removed from cold indifference; rarely, any kind of effective encouragement. I make no complaint about this. I simply note the fact in view of your seemingly ironical comment that "One of the great new revelations in Father Arrupe's message is that today, above all times, Catechesis includes—and quite legitimately so—the political dimension of Christian living and accountability". It is precisely because it has not done so in the past that we find ourselves driven to the point in the present where we must include in our Catechesis not only the political and social dimension of Christian living, but also a clear exposition of Marxism which is finding increasing favour among so many today, Catholics very much included, as an alternate way of life. Surely this is the least we can do under our present circumstances to which past neglect has brought us.

An Unwarranted Conclusion

What really amazes me is your reaction to this perfectly sound proposition of the Jesuit Superior General. I find it not merely strange, I have to confess, but unjust. In the first place, you appear to interpret in terms quite other than those intended by himself, Father Arrupe's call for "an explicit treatment of Marxism" within a Catechesis that takes account of the political and social dimension of Christian living. The Jesuit General's object is perfectly clear; that we should know contemporary Marxism for what it is when set against "the perspective of a serene presentation of the Christian faith and Christian life". In the light of this kind of understanding of contemporary Marxism we are placed in a position to exercise true discernment with regard to it; which can only be to everyone's best advantage, not least that of the Marxists themselves. I find these sentiments of Father Arrupe realistic and wholly admirable. By contrast, you draw an entirely different and, if I may say so, unwarranted conclusion from his words. The procedure you adopt in order to arrive at

it I find little short of incredible. You interpret Father Arrupe's call for "an explicit treatment of Marxism" within Christian Catechesis as a plea on his part for the inclusion and positive advocacy of Communist socio-political programmes not merely within, but as part and parcel of contemporary Christian catechetical programmes. The mental confusion which leads you to this extraordinary and scarcely credible conclusion would appear to have arisen in the following way. You contrast what you describe with approval as the "polemic vein" employed by Pope Pius XI in his condemnation of Communism in *Divine Redemptoris* (1937) with Father Arrupe's recommendation that Christian Catechetics consider contemporary Marxism "not in a polemical vein, but in the perspective of a serene presentation of the Christian faith and Christian life". Any fair-minded man will tell you that both methods of procedure have their merits. It is quite wrong to assume that the use of one, is always superior to the other. Circumstances must be allowed to decide. This much is elementary. What I find illicit and scarcely credible is your seeming conclusion that part-commitment, at least, to Communist ideology is at the back of Father Arrupe's call for a non-polemical approach to contemporary Marxism. "Father Arrupe and his followers (*sic*)", you inform us "have now discovered that many elements of Marxist ideology, properly so called, are in the very air they breathe . . . Hence the only honest thing for them to do is to help bring Marxist socio-political programmes into the very process of Catechesis, taking advantage of the momentous options that these programmes are offering to Catholic believers".

Forced Interpretation

There you have it. You arrive at your extraordinary and quite illegitimate conclusion that Father Arrupe's call for a non-polemical consideration of Marxism is due to his commitment in part, at least, to Communist ideology, by forcing on another phrase employed by him in his article a meaning that common parlance among men would never, under normal circumstances, allow it to bear. The phrase occurs at the outset of the third paragraph of Father Arrupe's article where he remarks that "so many elements

of the Marxist ideology, properly so called, are in the very air we breathe". You pounce on these words with avidity and proceed to saddle them with a meaning quite foreign to that commonly understood in normal parlance between civilised human beings. In illustration, let me point out to you that, if I were to say to someone of normal intelligence that Marxism was "in the air" or "in the air we breathe", he would *not* take me to mean that I breathed it with approval as something in which I believed, to which I was ideologically committed and which was for me now a new source of life. The phrase is ideologically neutral. He would take me to mean that I found everywhere round me a Marxist atmosphere or *ambience*, whether I liked it or not; that the climate of opinion in the city or country or university where I happened to be was Marxist. This much and nothing more would be the significance of the phrase employed by myself in my conversation with him. This is its *normal* and *neutral* meaning. Take another example or two for your own enlightenment, if for no other reason. Having recently returned from Pakistan, a Muslim country, I could remark with truth that Islam was in the very air I breathed there. No one in his senses would deduce from this remark that I was now committed to Islam. What he would understand was that, in Pakistan, I found the Islamic outlook on life pervading that country's atmosphere to the point where it could be fairly described as being in the very air I breathed. This is the normal interpretation normally placed on this phrase in normal conversation. Anyone who proclaimed in public after hearing it that I was now converted to Islam would be guilty of traducing me, of damaging my good name to an alarming degree. It is exactly the same with Father Arrupe's remark concerning Marxist ideology. It is in the very air we breathe—in the wind, if you like—as anyone acquainted with contemporary trends will tell you; but this does not mean that we are committed to it; that because Father Arrupe scents it in the air—to vary the phrase—he is a committed Marxist; that he is breathing in the Marxist ozone, which is for him now a new, life-giving ideology. This conclusion is as absurd as it is false and it is based on a totally illegitimate interpretation of an expression which you appear as having wrenched from its normal meaning in order to make it suit

your purposes. Either this—for which there is really no excuse; or you have to be excused on grounds of what has to be described as invincible ignorance. I am sorry, but I can see it no other way.

Evidence of Forced Interpretation

In evidence of this distortion which I am forced to attribute to you, I must cite at some little length a passage from your second article. In it you note quite correctly that, in May 1965, Paul VI charged the Society of Jesus and its General, Father Arrupe, with the task of opposing militant atheism. You then continue as follows in the light of Father Arrupe's article, which you suggest we consider (with what justification I know not) as "a report to the Church on how he has accomplished it". This is what you say:

"Father Arrupe and his followers have studied into the matter and they have now discovered that many elements of Marxist ideology, properly so called, are in the very air they breathe, even though they sometimes attempt to draw a distinction between limited socio-political projects of Marxists and a radical change in the whole concept of society in relation to human destiny. Hence the only honest thing for them to do is to help bring Marxist socio-political programmes into the very process of catechesis, taking advantage of the momentous options that these programmes are offering to Catholic believers . . ."

There follows a further paragraph which consists mainly of a series of rhetorical questions.⁴ I shall return to the third and final one of these questions in a minute for, in its course, I am afraid, you reveal yourself as unacquainted with most vital distinctions made with regard to contemporary Marxism by Pope John in his Encyclical *Pacem in Terris* and Pope Paul in his Apostolic Letter, *Octogesima Adveniens*. In his article, "Marxism and Catechesis", Father Arrupe is doing no more than follow the lead of these two Popes. It follows that, in condemning him you are also condemning both of them. I trust that you and the Editor of the *Wanderer* will take note of this. Meanwhile, let me quote your next two paragraphs in further

evidence of the distortion, which I am forced to attribute to you:

"Father Arrupe's advice about Marxism and catechesis is a strange messianism to the Catholic believer. It is an even stranger outcome of the solemn task entrusted to him by Pope Paul VI and the Church. It certainly does not indicate that he has ever found out what Marxism is all about, or what Marxist socio-political programmes intend, or what Christian life is really like under Communism, or how thankful we as Christians should be for the politico-social freedom of the West, or what Pope Paul was talking about when he handed the Jesuits their solemn task.

"The idea of 'fighting for God under the standard of the Cross' does not come through in Father Arrupe's article. He is trying too hard to conform to this world, namely, to 'elements' in the socio-political programmes of militant atheists and dialectical materialists. Has Father Arrupe become a Marxist? From the text of this article it appears that he has, inasmuch as a Marxist is a person who has in the air he breathes elements of Marxist ideology properly so called, and this conclusion appears valid, even though it is at times necessary to draw a distinction — where such distinction can be effectively made — between a militantly atheistic Marxist who clearly sees what he is aiming for and a confused Marxist who thinks that religion can somehow prosper in a Marxist society".

I cite these passages from your second article at some length because they bear out perfectly the point I have made; viz., that you have forced onto a phrase employed by Father Arrupe an interpretation quite other than that which it normally bears and that as a result of this forced interpretation you have made of the Jesuit Superior General that which he most certainly is not — a Marxist ideologue. From which you conclude—again quite falsely — that his appeal for an explicit treatment of Marxism within a Catechesis that takes account of the political and social dimension of Catholic living is, in fact, the plea of a Communist ideologue for the positive advocacy of

Marxist programmes as part and parcel of Christian and Catholic catechetical instruction. Objectively considered, this is not merely nonsense, but malicious nonsense. I can find excuse for it only in what appears to me as the near-invincible ignorance, which has caused you to force on a phrase employed by Father Arrupe in his article a meaning it can in no way be made to bear. Your basic misunderstanding is there.

Press Conference at Puebla

You probably have not seen, as I have seen, the report of an interview given by Father Arrupe to the Press at the time of the Puebla Conference, to which he was invited by the Vatican Representative, Cardinal Baggio. Amongst other things, the Press conference is important because, in it, the Jesuit General gave the lie direct to the conclusion you draw from his article in so untutored a fashion in your first two articles. You could say, of course, that his answer on this occasion is only a trick and that, being a good Communist, Father Arrupe is using the lie to still suspicion of his real intentions and promote thereby the good of the Party. I trust—I feel sure, in fact—that you will not allow yourself to sink to this depth of ignominy and that you will take my Superior General at his word. This is what he said in the course of his reply to a long question put to him by Senor Sanchez Steinpreis of “Radio-programmas”, Mexico:

“The Society of Jesus can never accept any ideology which defends or is based on atheism. We cannot align ourselves with such thought. Perhaps, and this is very different, some think that certain elements of Marxist analysis can be validly used to examine society. This does not mean a defence of Marxist ideology; rather, the study of certain positive elements contained in other ideologies or other religions. This is admitted by the Synod itself and Vatican II when they speak of the ‘semina Verbi’, that is, valid elements contained in Hinduism, Buddhism, Islam or other religions. We need to study these elements as a point of departure for a constructive dialogue with other religions and ideologies”.

A Valid Distinction

This passage is valuable not only for its rebuttal of your illicit contention that Father Arrupe is a Marxist ideologue. It is valuable because it points again to a distinction, made by Father Arrupe in his article, and which you refuse to accept and, in fact, deride. I mentioned a few lines back that I was going to return to that paragraph in Part II of your critique of Father Arrupe's article, which followed the one I quoted and which was made up largely of a series of rhetorical questions. One of those questions runs as follows. You ask, "How can Father Arrupe encourage the Church to rely on an elusive mental distinction between Marxist political action and 'the whole concept of society in relation to human destiny', when everyone knows that Marxist socio-political programmes have built into them militant opposition to the Christian concept of society in relation to human destiny?" In answer to your question, I should like to point out in the first place that the distinction made by Father Arrupe in the second paragraph of his article was *not* between Marxist socio-political programmes and the Christian concept of society in relation to human destiny, but between "that which is in effect a limited socio-political project and that which involves a radical change of the whole concept of society in relation to human destiny". Allow me to point out that a limited socio-political project that receives the backing of Marxists is by no means necessarily the same as a Marxist socio-political programme, in that this latter is much more likely to be linked with Marxist ideology than the former. This, surely, is obvious. It follows that the distinction which Father Arrupe seeks to make between the two — even though by no means always practical—is not to be derided as elusive and impossible. Further and as indicated above, in making this distinction Father Arrupe is following in the footsteps of Pope John XXIII, who made the classic distinction in this regard in *Pacem in Terris*, published in 1963, and Pope Paul VI who cites this distinction with approval in *Octogesima Adveniens*, first published in 1971, and proceeds to enlarge on it. Pope John's distinction is between ideologies and concrete historical movements sprung from and in part distinct from them. "Who can deny", he asks, "that

those movements, in so far as they conform to the dictates of right reason and are interpreters of the lawful aspirations of the human person, contain elements that are positive and deserving of approval?" The implications are clear enough. They are taken up and considered in their application to contemporary Socialism and Marxism—also, interestingly enough, limitlessly competitive Capitalism—by Paul VI in paragraphs 29-35 (inc.) of his Apostolic Letter. His conclusions are positive. The distinctions are valid, though great caution must be employed in arriving at them and in pursuing lines of analysis and, indeed, action derived from them. Let the Christian go ahead. It is important that he should do so now when, in the words of Pope Paul, "It is possible to speak of a retreat of ideologies. In this respect the present time may be favourable for an openness to the concrete transcendence of Christianity". (*Octogesima Adveniens*, 29.) In other words, the candle should be lit. Your reaction to Father Arrupe's attempt to do so, following the lead given by the Popes, is to try and blow it out in his face. I must say I think this a somewhat futile proceeding. My hope is that, after considerable reflection, you will come to the same conclusion in this regard.

APOSTOLATE OF CATHOLIC TRUTH

Publishes several times a year a Digest, which we recommend very highly. Subscription £2.50 a year. Apply to: Mr. P. F. Swarbrick, 52, Moorcroft Crescent, Ribblesdale, Preston PR2 6DP, Lancs.

Deliver Us from Novices

ARCHBISHOP ROBERT J. DWYER

“**D**ELIVER me, O Lord”, the Bishop pleaded, plumping down on his horny knees, “Deliver me from the indifference of Saul, from the greediness of Hophni, from the plunder of Athaliah, from the profligacy of Ahithophel, from the foolishness of Zoan . . .” Then, having for the nonce exhausted his litany of Old Testament malefactors, he bethought himself of more immediate woes. “Deliver me”, he groaned, “from the doctrine of men unlearned and unestablished, from the pride of novices, from the people resisting the priest. . .”

“From the pride of novices. . .”

The Lord Bishop of Winchester

The Right Reverend Father in God, Lancelot Andrewes, Lord Bishop of Winchester, knew wherefor he prayed. In an age of religious dissension and decline he at least was conspicuous for the integrity, even the rigidity, of his life.

His career as a churchman fell within the last years of Elizabeth and over the full reign of James I, while his theological acumen and polemical ability made him a not unworthy antagonist of the great St. Robert Bellarmine.

In many ways Andrewes was a typical Counter-Reformation prelate, not altogether dissimilar to his contemporary, the Bishop of Geneva, St. Francis de Sales. He too was deeply, genuinely concerned with the welfare of religion in his times, gravely disturbed by the Separatist tendencies which were breaking down the Anglican ascendancy, and fully persuaded that an interior reformation of the Church, a clarification of her doctrines, a cleansing of her morals, and a tightening of her discipline, were essential to her survival.

A Book of Devotions

Forerunner of Archbishop Laud though he was, by contrast he was a far gentler spirit in whose veins ran the ichor of ecumenism.

The inner man shines through the pages of his published *Devotions*. Here, in the stately language of the great era, from the same pen that helped to frame the rhythmic prose of the King James' Version, is the man on his knees in the presence of his God.

It is one of the supreme classics of religious literature, rendered into the vernacular by John Henry Newman and John Mason Neale, and it might well serve us as refreshment from the feebleness and flippancy of so many of our contemporary English renderings of the liturgical Latin, whether of the Sacred Scripture, the Mass, the administration of the Sacraments, or the Divine Office.

Deliver Us from Difficulties

"From ills and difficulties in the Church", prayed Lancelot Andrewes, "good Lord, deliver us !" A hardy, perennial prayer, seldom if ever answered with benign indulgence by that Eternal Wisdom which manifestly sees fit to keep the Spouse of the Holy Spirit in unremitting awareness that she is but a wayfarer and pilgrim here below, standing in need of constant reformation by the Chastening Hand.

Our prayer, nevertheless, like Bishop Andrewes', is insistent. It would seem, in all conscience, that the Church has enough enemies and evil-wishers outside her communion to render interior disturbance quite superfluous. But no, it is from within the sanctuary that the lightning flashes and the thunder roars.

Honest criticism, surely, the Church requires, as the operation of her prophetic spirit, but set forth with that prudence which honorably seeks to avoid the scandal of the little ones for which (it is Our Lord who said it) drowning with millstones is the appropriate punishment.

"From private interpretation . . .," the Bishops supplication continued its unwearying way (could he have been just a thought forgetful of the possibility that his own ecclesiastical polity, so carefully formulated, rested itself upon certain pillars of private interpretation ?)

"From innovation in things sacred, from heterodox teaching; from unhealthy enquiries and interminable disputes. . ." Not from honest discussion, not from theological

debate as potentially fruitful as his contest of words with Bellarmine.

Would that the two could have sat down together, face to face, rather than spreading their ink over acres of foolscap, niggling over minor misapprehensions and suspecting villainies! Not from that necessary development, whether in the comprehension of dogma or in the practice of the liturgy, which would help make religion relevant to succeeding generations of men with all their shifting preoccupations.

"From making gods of kings. . .," prayed the valiant defender of the Divine Right of Kings. And this whether the monarchs in question be Elizabeth I or Jamey Stuart, that half fool, half genius, or the tyranny of democracy emancipated from constitutional safeguards and limitations.

"From flattering of people. . .," from the popular supposition that a majority of noses is thereby established in its own divine right. So many things coursed through the mind of Bishop Andrewes from which the Lord, in the bowels of His Mercy, might vouchsafe graciously to deliver him.

Novices

But chiefly, one thinks, mulling over the old prayer-book, catching some savor of its incense, "From the pride of novices, O Lord, deliver me!" For of all our afflictions this is the worst.

Deliver Us from Novices

Novices let loose in the Church today, callow youths, middle-aged misfits in the religious life, beardedlings and greybeards who have never grown up, never matured, who stomp around the sanctuary, shouting their puerile blasphemies, egging one another on to call their Mother a strumpet, fools strutting their pride.

It is not love of Mother Church which inspires them; it is the hankering for self-assertion. Nor is it devotion to the truth nor that passion for reform which is willing to begin with the self. It is pride, the essential sin of Lucifer. It is the death-wish that would pull the temple down just to capture attention.

O Lord, deliver us!

In this penetrating article Dr. James Hitchcock, Professor of History at St. Louis University, Missouri, U.S.A., shows the interconnection between the relaxation of religious life that came in the wake of Vatican II and the secularization of religious ideals. He goes on to indicate the almost inevitable drift of the secularized mentality into support for state totalitarianisms. Acknowledgements to the *Osservatore Romano*.

The New Religion of Politics

DR. JAMES HITCHCOCK

ONE of the intriguing things about an age of crisis like this one is the fact that so often what is lost, or lost sight of, is what is in fact very obvious, so obvious that it comes to be taken for granted. Many religious communities have lost their way in the past fifteen years not because of some esoteric or subtle error but because they chose to ignore the obvious. In the category of the obvious is, first of all, the fact that religious life makes no sense except in the perspective of eternity. This has always been recognized in the Church since the days of the earliest desert monks. Yet after the second Vatican Council there were many religious (and, more generally, many Catholics) who chose to ignore that reality, who began to act as though their religious commitment was primarily this-worldly. It is not surprising, although apparently it has been to many people, that, given this decision to ignore the eternal, religious life rapidly started to unwind, communities to fall apart.

Relaxation and Religious Life

The dominant mood of the post-conciliar Church can be described as one of relaxation, although there is no justification whatever for that idea in the documents of the

Council itself. Catholicism has historically been a religion of tension, a tension between this world and the next, between flesh and spirit. It has been a religion which teaches the necessity of striving, of self-discipline, of continual aspiration towards something higher. What many people wrongfully interpreted the Council to be saying was that such striving was no longer necessary. We could live as good citizens of the world, at ease with ourselves and the world around us. We could relax. There was to be a "return to normalcy" in the sense that Warren Harding used that slogan to win the 1920 election—a cessation of idealism, a simple desire to have fun and enjoy life. This desire for relaxation naturally hit the religious orders with special force, since it was these communities which historically were supposed to demonstrate the demanding way of Christian perfection. Along with this desire for relaxation went something else closely related to it—the determination on the part of many priests and religious that they would no longer be special people, that they would no longer try to live a life of perfection. Some people left the religious life during the post-conciliar crisis because they thought they saw the opportunity to do something more exciting and more meaningful somewhere else. But many more perhaps left because they simply wanted to live a normal life as American society understands the concept or normalcy. The escape from eternity was an escape from a vision of life which seemed to "distract" Christians from full enjoyment of this life. It was also, in many ways, a turning away from God, not in the complete and deliberate sense, but in the sense of a desire to encounter God only in easily manageable ways. Many Christians were now uncomfortable with the blinding light of God and wanted only small flickers of him mediated to themselves through daily experience. Religious life was rejected, or changed beyond all recognition, because of its intensity, because it sought to bring the religious into contact with God in too uncompromising and powerful a way. God could no longer be allowed to dominate one's life but had to be relegated to a properly modest corner of it.

A Great Undiscussed Question

Interestingly, one of the great undiscussed questions in

the contemporary Church is again one of the most obvious ones: Do we in fact live with Christ eternally after death, or is death the end? One suspects that far more Catholics have doubts about that question now than would have been the case twenty years ago. Yet it is not talked about. We are led to assume that, of course, all Catholics believe in the after-life, but let us not distract ourselves from the needs of this life. However, a belief like this, once it is merely taken for granted, is soon in danger of being forgotten completely or treated as though it did not matter. What we have here is really a massive failure of the imagination, despite the fact that our age talks incessantly about being "imaginative". Many people find it impossible to imagine the prospect of eternity. Their imaginations are impoverished and are restricted to the daily world of their experience. Naturally this turning away from eternity, this pretence that religious life could continue to be meaningful if understood in exclusively worldly terms, led to disasters in the religious life and in the Church generally. Things began to fall apart because they ceased to make sense.

Accompanying this is what I call the loss of history, that is, the loss of a vital and meaningful sense of one's own past and one's own traditions, to the point where one's own past ceases to make any sense and becomes only a deadening burden, an irrational imposition. The Second Vatican Council urged that the renewal of religious life take place in accordance with the original vision of the founder of each community. Yet I suspect that many communities today would have great difficulty understanding their founder's vision. By the criteria which they have become accustomed to using, the founder would appear to be narrow and fanatical, lacking especially in what is now called social consciousness. Every founder emphasized very strongly the other-worldly goals of religious life.

The Imperial Self

Finally, we come to the most basic disease of contemporary moral life, the imperial self, the notion that the self alone has the right to define reality, to judge right from wrong, to accept or reject rules and teachings. The Christian notion of conscience has been perverted to make the

individual will the sole arbiter of right and wrong. The idea of freedom has been perverted to mean that no person should accept anything "imposed" from the outside. The concept of human "needs" has been fatally confused with the concept of "wants" so that whatever any person desires at a given moment is elevated to the status of a good. There is no need to observe how such a mentality plays havoc with any meaningful kind of religion or morality.

All of these things taken together—the flight from eternity, the return to normalcy, the loss of history, and the imperialism of the self—lead to a condition of confusion, weakness, and disorientation in the Church. The Catholic, and especially the member of a religious community, is left immobile and stranded, incapable of meaningful action because everything has been stripped of meaning. Such people find themselves in desperate need of some guidance, of some impetus that will get them moving again, and as a result they tend to become inordinately dependent on passing fashions. Only when they are carried along by history do they have any sense of direction or purpose. They need continual assurances from their society that they are doing the right thing, continual clues as to what they are supposed to be doing. They have no genuine self-motivation, no beliefs or principles which are genuinely their own.

Those who are faithful to the traditions of the past are often accused of being insecure, of "clinging" to the past because they cannot face the instability of the present. The truth of the matter is that in a culture like our own, fidelity to the traditions of the past can only be a source of insecurity, since nothing is more certain in modern life than the fact that those who are faithful to past traditions will ultimately see those traditions and the values they embody assaulted and undermined. The only true psychological security now comes from having fixed beliefs, of being able to move with the times, of easily adapting to every cultural change. This was what the book *Future Shock*—so popular both in religious and secular circles—was all about.

Root of Political Preoccupation

Here we find the root of the contemporary religious preoccupation with politics. It is not, as it is so often asser-

ted, that today's religious are somehow more compassionate, more attuned to human needs, than those of the past. The immensely impressive network of charities operated by religious over the years belies this contention. Rather, for many contemporary religious, politics is the last frontier of certitude, the secular movement which most effectively provides them with a sense of purpose and direction. Politics is also the last frontier of dogma. Those Catholics who, faced with a question of sexual morality, insist that we have no final answers, that right and wrong differ according to circumstances, that human intention counts for more than the law, are not likely to take the same attitude with regard to, for example, the California grape strike. Those Catholics who tell us that on dogmatic questions we must eschew absolute certitude and admit our fallibility are likely to be those who are completely certain on such contemporary social issues as the Panama Canal treaty and the future of Rhodesia.

The point here is not whether these people are right or wrong in their political opinions but their strange double standard whereby in religion they preach humility, deference, and self-doubt, while in politics they allow themselves the luxury of dogmatic certainty, aggressiveness, even arrogance.

Political Dogmatism

There is no ecumenism in contemporary politics. We do not hear about opponents and proponents of the Equal Rights Amendment, supporters and critics of the California grape strike, pacifists and those who favour greater military preparedness sitting down with one another and undertaking to "dialogue" in a spirit of good-will and mutual trust. We do not hear of them attempting to reformulate their own beliefs in such a way as to make them more acceptable to the other side. Rather the contrary. To do so is commonly regarded as treason to the cause. Compromise is thought of as morally tainted. Rigorous and unbending purity of belief is admired. Such political dogmatism—we might almost say political fanaticism—is not new. What is rather new is the eagerness with which so many Catholics, and especially so many priests and religious, have embraced

it. Their eagerness is a token, I am afraid, of their religious bankruptcy, of the fact that there is a large empty space inside, once filled by their desire to serve God, which new needs to be filled by secular causes. (It is impossible not to wonder, for example, what is holding certain communities of women together other than their shared feminist ideology. They appear to have no common rule, style of life, spirituality, or work).

We can assume, I think, that those who entered religious life in the past were among the most intense, zealous, and dedicated young people in the Church. The abandonment of religious life in its classic forms has left many of these people floundering, bereft of vision and purpose in life, yet desperately in need of one. On the contemporary scene political causes alone seem capable of providing this lost sense of total dedication.

Deification of Politics

Much of this new religiosity of politics centres on the ordinary forms of democratic electoral politics. By a strange process which Catholics have not understood, once politics is declared to be independent of religion, that is, totally secular, it is soon deified, that is, rendered sacred. It is no exaggeration to say that for many contemporary Christians political activity—walking picket lines, making speeches, drafting platforms, campaigning on behalf of favoured candidates—has taken on a sacred meaning, has become in effect a new liturgy, far more meaningful than the old liturgy. It became a cliché, but a true one, in the late 1960's to say that one never discovered that certain people were members of religious orders until someone organized a demonstration and they could appear in full habits, garments which were otherwise left in the closet, on the grounds that they were distractions from the needs of modern life.

Admiration for Totalitarian Regimes

There is also a more sinister aspect of this new religion of politics, which is the admiration which many avant-garde Catholics show towards totalitarian regimes, especially Mao Tse-Tung's China and Fidel Castro's Cuba. This

support is especially strange, given the almost obsessive concern with personal freedom which most of these same people manifest with regard to American society and the Catholic Church.

Consider the descriptions of contemporary China which have been purveyed to the West by numerous visitors in recent years. It is, we are told, a place of almost obsessive physical cleanliness, without litter. Public morals are extremely high, with no prostitution or drunkenness. The people all wear very simple, austere, and uniform clothes; there is no regard for fashion or personal adornment. At regular intervals during the day people come *en masse* to centres where they are catechized in the doctrines of Chairman Mao and instructed in what is the "correct" position to take on all public questions. To reinforce this unanimity of opinion, wall slogans constantly proclaim the stated truth and exhort the faithful to greater efforts on behalf of the cause. Most striking is the fact that the Chinese people, apparently have no desire to express themselves in an individualistic way, to pursue goals of personal fulfilment. They are content merely to serve as they are needed, in whatever capacity their society requires of them.

It takes no great imagination to realize that the spirit which is operative here (probably exaggerated by Westerners eager to see China as a Utopia) is similar in many respects to the spirit which used to be characteristic of religious communities before the "reforms" of the post-conciliar era. Why, then, has there been this obsessive demand for "freedom" and personal autonomy among many western religious, while some of these same people look to distant totalitarian states for inspiration? The answer to this question has already been implied—many of those Catholics who have so eagerly embraced "reform" now experience that aching spiritual void left by the jettisoning of so much of what they held to be sacred. Admiration for regimes like that of China is a form of nostalgia, a yearning for what has been lost, not projected into the past, as nostalgia usually is, but into a utopian present and future.

This admiration for totalitarianism also shows once again how the new political awareness is for many Catho-

lics a substitute religion. They will tolerate, and even embrace, in the name of a more perfect social order, conditions and ideas which they have already rejected in the Church itself. In politics they are prepared to surrender their personal freedom, their autonomy, in the name of a higher good. They deem it a privilege to be asked to give themselves totally to the cause, even as they are condemning such dedication in religion. The appeal of this kind of fanatical politics to decadent Westerners will probably remain a permanent feature of our cultural life. For example, a Maryknoll priest living in Hong Kong writes regretfully of the "materialism" of that Western outpost and looks longingly across the straits to China, where everyone is good. He quotes Henry Kissinger, "The Chinese still have a *Weltanschauung* (a world view) while the rest of us have lost our way".

Counterfeits of Christianity

There can be no doubt that Christianity at the present time is engaged in an intense struggle with certain messianic political movements for the souls of people throughout the world, and that one significant and disturbing aspect of that struggle is that many Christians are not even aware that it is going on. Some in fact are serving the enemy without even realizing it. As Christianity recedes as a powerful and compelling system of belief, ever more fanatical kinds of political orthodoxy will move in to fill the void. Christians are constantly being offered counterfeits of faith, which many accept because they have nothing better.

There is now so little specifically Christian heroism in the world, so little martyrdom, so few visible saints. Hence the hearts of young people in particular are not stirred up to aspire to the heroic path of sanctity which in times past was responsible for countless numbers of good Christian lives and dedicated service to the Church. In their rush to become just as worldly as everyone else, consecrated religious in particular have ceased trying to convey to children, at a very sensitive time in their lives, the possibility of living an extraordinary, even a heroic life.

The appeal of political religion is not difficult to understand. For many the prospect of an earthly utopia is far

more vivid than the prospect of eternal life. The invitation to join in creating such a utopia is also very flattering—why waste time on humble tasks like teaching children or nursing the sick when one can aspire to nothing less than recreating the world? In this context the “distraction” of other-worldliness, the danger that people will once again think seriously about the prospect of eternity, has to be opposed untiringly.

Christians Make Christianity Irrelevant

It is also not difficult to understand why the humble tasks traditionally associated with religious life might have little appeal in comparison with the grandiose prospects which the new political religion holds out. There is, however, one very practical point which should be borne in mind—humble tasks like teaching and nursing do accomplish something, however limited it may be. To give oneself to the great scheme of remaking the world is to court the possibility that one's work will come to nothing that the whole enterprise will turn out, as has so often been the case in the past, to be an empty adventure.

It is quite extraordinary how little authentic Christian prophecy there is in the political realm today, despite all the talk about it. For the most part what passes as prophecy is merely Christians echoing, and usually echoing rather badly, what has already been said, and said better, by other people. Many Christians try to prove the “relevance” of their faith by showing secularists that they believe the same things the secularists believe. The only thing they succeed in doing however, is confirming the secularists' opinion that Christianity truly is irrelevant and need not be taken seriously.

Abortion is an instructive instance, since it is the one crucial point at which authentic Catholic witness at present clashes with so much of received secular wisdom, and it is shocking and disheartening to see how so many Catholics, and even many religious, seem quite prepared to surrender on the abortion question in the interests of “more important” political goals. Given the religion of politics which is so pervasive at present, there is a growing tendency on the part of many Catholics to allow the state to take the

lead on moral questions, so that once the state has decided to permit and even encourage abortions it becomes "divisive" to question this policy.

Christians and the Omni Competent State

In fact we are faced with the prospect, by the end of this century of most private charitable institutions — schools, hospitals, nursing homes, etc. — being taken over by the state, mainly through financial pressure, leaving religion without any effective social expression. We will be allowed to believe our strange doctrines, but we will be prevented from giving them effective public expression.

In the end it may well turn out that, paradoxically, it is precisely the humble tasks—teaching children and young people in schools that are genuinely Catholic, creating medical environments which likewise manifest the true spirit of Christ—that will be effective in transforming the world. Those who join in the great utopian political adventures may find that they merely end by supporting the final triumph of a militant secularism, while those who have taken the pains to keep alive and nourish genuinely Christian institutions will be those who have provided a place for truth and freedom to dwell.

The history of the Church shows that, from time to time, God does confront his people with new tasks. New religious communities are formed to perform these tasks, or existing communities are altered to meet new needs. We cannot say that in our own day religious are bound solely by those apostolates they have carried on in the past or that they cannot and should not change. What we can insist, however, is that tasks which are so basic and so firmly rooted in the life of the Church be not cavalierly thrown away as of no importance. And above all we can insist that Christians who go into the world, genuinely go for the sake of saving it, that they go as true ambassadors of Christ.

In this article, Henry Edwards shows that, in this country it was the Tory Radicals of the last century and not the Marxists who wrote and protested against the dehumanization and alienation of the worker by the new industrialism. Marx, in fact, had and has no real remedy to offer for alienation because his system is essentially anti-personalist. For him, man is of value, not in himself, but only as part of the collective; thereby, he is depersonalized.

Concerning Alienation and Marxism

HENRY EDWARDS

AT the beginning of 1937 I was bidden by my tutor to spend several weeks in the Goldsmiths' Library in Kensington where, day after day, I read tract and pamphlet concerning the economic and industrial revolutions which began towards the end of the 18th century. At first I expected the critics would all be "radicals". I was wrong. Of course, the word "radical" is neutral. Certain critics like Cobbett were "radical"; but their radicalism was based upon a sense of tradition, so that in a most correct sense it would be proper to call them radical Tories. This becomes apparent when we read their polemics against the radicals we think of as radicals, e.g. Mill and Bentham. Of the second sort there were many artless pamphleteers who held that all a working man had to do was to save about £100 and then branch out to become a capitalist. It hardly needs saying that most of these radicals were *ipso facto* not merely defenders but promoters of what is rather badly called "the capitalist system". Not altogether by the way. They would have defended Scrooge; they were to be found among capitalists who had become Nonconformist Protestants so that they could demand their workers to

work on such days at Christmas; and they bolstered up the total abstinence movement because drunkenness led to Monday absenteeism.

Tory Radicals

Apart from the few pamphlets by early and rather utopian socialists, the critics who pointed to what we call alienation because of the new system (if it were a system) were the "reactionaries". The word "alienation" remained stored in my mind for years. It would sometimes come to the fore of my mind and then retreat. I had early discovered that socialists of many schools, communists and anarchists discussed alienation. On the other hand, the strongest opponents of the new system on the grounds of alienation seemed to me to be Tories like Southey, Coleridge, Tom Hood and the young Disraeli. I believe that it was in the same year, 1844, that Engels, the wealthy friend of Karl Marx, produced his *Condition of the Working Classes in England*, and Disraeli the best seller, *Sybil or The Two Nations*.

Their subject was the same. Of course, I have to make every allowance for the somewhat arid statistical work which Engels was bound to make; but, making such allowance, I have no doubt whatever that Disraeli was seeing past the facts to the appalling alienation which so many billions were suffering. Moreover, Disraeli's was no work of fiction in the sense that it was fantasy or drawn from mere imagination. There were the facts that infanticide was more common in Yorkshire than on the banks of the Ganges, that a certain kind of shoddy called Devildust—to make which cheap flour was necessary—was a staple so well known that he could give the name to one of his characters, and that baby farmers fed their foster-children on Godfrey's Cordial, a cheap syrup based on opium, so that a virtually legal infanticide thrived.

Let me quote almost at random from *Sybil* :

"It is war that created these ruins, civil war; of all our civil wars the most inhuman, for it was waged by the unresisting. The monasteries were taken by storm, sacked, gutted, sometimes blown up—you may see the marks of the blast against the tower there. Never was such a plunder.

The whole face of the country for a century was that of a land recently invaded by a ruthless enemy; nor has England ever lost this character of revenge. I don't know whether the union workhouses will remove it. They are building something for the people at last. After an experiment of three centuries, your gaols being full, and your treadmills losing something of their virtue, you have given us a substitute for the monasteries.

"The man seated himself : he commenced his daily task. Twelve hours of daily labour at the rate of one penny an hour; and even this labour is mortgaged. 'How is this to end ? Is it rather not ended?' And he looked around him at his chamber without resources : no food, no fuel, no furniture and four human beings dependent on him and lying in their wretched beds because they had no clothes. 'I cannot sell my loom', he continued, 'at the price of old firewood and it cost me gold. It was not vice that brought me to this nor indolence nor imprudence. I was born to labour. I loved my loom and my loom loved me. It gave me a cottage in my native village, surrounded by a garden of whose claims on my solicitude it was not jealous. There was time for both. It gave me a wife, a maiden I had ever loved : and it gathered my children round my hearth with plenteousness and peace. I was content. I sought no other lot. It is adversity that makes me look back upon the past with tenderness. Then why am I here ? . . . It is that the capitalist has found a slave that has supplanted the labour and ingenuity of man. Once he was an artisan; at the best he now only watches machines, and even that occupation slips from his grasp to the woman and the child. The capitalist flourishes, he amasses immense wealth; we sink lower and lower—lower than the beasts of burden, for they are fed better, cared for more".

Perhaps there are a vast number of English-speaking people who have next to no idea that Disraeli was quite typically Tory in his day in making this kind of criticism on the industrial revolution and its main result, the alienation of the bulk of the population of England, Wales, Scotland and Ireland; the first nations so to suffer this fate. The Marx-Engels 1848 *Communist Manifesto* has an appendix which gives Disraeli and other Tories this credit : "At

times, by their bitter and witty criticism, striking the bourgeoisie to the very heart's core". But somehow one has to do considerable research, if only to provide a pointer or two. The "official" historians seem to have been so well briefed that only a genuine rebel dare look and then assert. Now and again someone will concede the work of Shaftesbury and Wilberforce. The Tory pamphleteers impressed me, not because of any economic arguments they produced. Indeed, it was clear to me that for them economics was of lesser importance than what for want of a better name I may call the claim of the human person to personality.

Individual and Person

This latter happens to be so close to the Gospel that for all practical purposes it should be taken as part of the Gospel, which is nothing if it is not to do with the freeing of a man from slavery caused by sin. The Gospel is the sole answer to the problem of alienation, considering here each person as he or she comes before it. But in those days when I read among the tracts in that library many of my contemporaries in the Rhonda Valleys were reading *Das Kapital* or (far more likely than not in an earlier decade) Sorel's *Reflections on Violence*: and they had no truck with my general attitude then to the vital problem of alienation. According to them Marx had provided a solution to the problem. No doubt, there are Marxists today who will insist upon that, even though it is fairly easy to show that Marx was essentially anti-personalist and therefore could not provide a solution. At this point I have to make what is no doubt to most readers a well known distinction: the distinction between the individual and the person. The former is a biological and sociological category—part of the species, sociologically part of society, anonymous, devoid of inner life, with no existence independent of the species or society, an entirely generic and social being, an element, a part, determined only by relation to the whole. Personality stands for a spiritual category and is therefore in another dimension. It is the likeness of a being superior to the simply natural and social and cannot be part of anything.

Berdyayev is right in asserting that personality is not *determined* by society, e.g. the nation. Personality is, however, as I have indicated, likely to be *conditioned* by society. And Berdyayev, the apostle-in-chief in our times of personalism, is right in demanding that personality has to be social. "It can realise the fullness of its life only in communion with other personalities". He is probably seriously wrong when he continues to assert that "the capitalist régime is the most antipersonalist that history has ever seen". In the context, he does not tell us what he means by "the capitalist régime"; and I believe that some other critics of "the capitalist régime" are as just as vague. It may be that there has never been a complete "capitalist régime"; and then it is not easy to say what this "capitalism" is. I am, however, quite sure that a process of depersonalisation and therefore alienation begins when, for example, a long-standing, aristocratic landlord has to sell his acres to pay death duties so that his old tenants find that their new landlord is a large insurance company. What makes alienation so inevitable in this sort of "capitalism" is the unhappy anonymity, which is its inevitable concomitant. Is the marxist solution, however, able to find apologists who may claim that it is at least by comparison personalist? For if the marxist solution is patient of any personalist element, it really would have something to say about alienation.

The Anti-personalism of Marx

One may well be surprised to hear any marxist claim here. The anti-personalism of Marx derives from Hegel, who demands the domination of the general over the individual and conceives personality to be void of value. One of the achievements of Kierkegaard is that he protested against the enslavement of the person to some universal spirit. "What use is Communism to a man in agony of soul?", cried Dostoevsky. Other Russians such as Bielinsky and later Ivan Karamasov (cf. *Le Socialisme de Bielinsky*) made the same point. Hegel's view was inherited by Feurbach, whose attitude is generic rather than personalist. Marx succeeded Feurbach and acknowledged the primacy of the generic over the personal. For Marx,

class is a primordial reality anterior to man. It is not I, a poor old age pensioner, living in a miner's cottage and being a wage-slave during his working life, who thinks and pronounces judgements and evaluates; but the class to which I belong. According to Marx, I am incapable of really independent thought and judgement. I am a function of my class. Therefore, when a person evidently does make judgements and so on differing radically from a "general line", he is either insane or a traitor—the latter *moral* charge indicating that, in practical applications of Marxism, some prior idea of a moral code prevails despite the coldly scientific. Although the Marxist theory of labour value is to be regarded as strictly scientific, as soon as it leaves its vacuum it becomes virtually confused in most people's minds with one of the sins that cry out to heaven for vengeance, the denial to the workman of his just hire. The strictly Marxist theory means that every workman is *per se* exploited even if he receives an extraordinary high wage: otherwise the capitalist (and today this must also mean the State or a Board) would have to shut up shop. "Exploitation" is a neutral word. It has a good meaning if I say that I have been exploiting the resources of my garden. It usually has a bad meaning when it is used in respect of people. Marx never studied the bourgeois: the bourgeois is simply a piece in an economic problem. This poverty of analysis is striking when we see it against the writings of Sombart, de Man, Weber and several of the so-called counter-revolutionaries including Coleridge, who, in such writings as his *Table Talk*, considered the shopkeeper's mind as tending toward an indifference to patriotism. You cannot properly study psychology if you confine yourself to the generic. The shopkeeper (in Coleridge's wide sense) *could* reach out to the virtue of patriotism; but he *prefers* to buy cheap and sell dear even if that does mean impairing the health of the nation to which he belongs. (That some shopkeepers may very well succeed in reaching out to the virtue at the expense of big profits we must also admit, but a good Marxist cannot admit it).

It has been said that Marx was one of the Victorian messianists, but his theory of man is a denial of the messianic or prophetic principle, which signifies the possible

elevation of a man above a collective because a prophet believes he is summoned by an inner voice. If Marx was a rebel against this world, his followers, according to Marx's theory of man, cannot be rebels. There is a crushing irony here. Marx seems to have been in revolt against the alienation of men as persons by reason of the capitalist régime which transformed personality into a thing, e.g. "hands wanted". Marx called the process *Verdinglichung*, a dehumanisation. The productive activity of a man is alienated and projected outside into the world of objective things. The result of this alienation is his enslavement. But, as Pieper in his *Leisure the Basis of Culture* lucidly and powerfully shows, both Marx and all others who rest their case upon the act of production—upon work as labour, so that even *opus* is subordinated to *labor*—demand as their solution that alienation must remain.

Marx, Religion and Alienation

Marx following Feurbach sees "religion" as an alienation of man's nature. Taking well into consideration what I have written concerning "religion" as man's attempt to set himself up against the Gospel, I must protest. The Marxist argument is that man, being poor has a god who is rich. Faith has, so to speak, proletarianised man. All man's riches have been alienated from him and transmitted to a god. But when man becomes rich, God will become the poorer and will disappear. The same argument is, after all, to be found in what we have heard called "the God of the gaps". It is true that many things and events have been mistakenly attributed to the miraculous or to some special intervention of God and that from time to time we find a natural reason for them. On the other hand, the curious claim we hear on many sides that in our day man has come of age and that he has no need of God because of his human maturity, will not do because man, in his present pride, has to face the awe-inspiring fact of his mortality. It is no wonder that, faced with this fact, the people who have got rid of God (as they think) want to push the fact of death into a dark corner. Nowadays people seldom die: they just "go". The God of the gaps remains, but the too clever will not genuflect.

Anti-Personalism and General Mood

In his important theory of the fetichism of commodities Marx displays his concern about man's alienation. He argues that the wealth created has been alienated and must be given back to the proletarian or rather the proletariat, the generic totality. One must rid oneself of any notion of an economic necessity; one must overcome it and free oneself from illusions of consciousness, which have given rise to the mendacious objectivisation of human activity. The centre of gravity is not economic life but the proletarian struggle. It is here and in his *Theses upon Feuerbach* that Marx shows he is not quite the materialist he is supposed to have been. In the first of these theses he asserts that the chief fault in hitherto existing materialism was that the object was conceived of only in the form of the object but not as human practice, not subjectively. This view is much closer to what we call existentialism, which tends to regard everything as subject and activity. No doubt Marx could not help being of his time (some people have not by any means been of their time). He has often been shown to have been what we call "Victorian". Today, people who call themselves Marxists may feel they have already taken the leap to freedom so that we have something like auto-movement among them. It makes no real difference to man the person. Marxist Communism has to be, despite its dynamism, the affirmation of the collective. The individual remains passive save that by dissolving himself in the midst of generic being "he" acquires a force. The finale is an absolutely anti-personalist philosophy and general mood. It cannot admit the intrinsic value of each man, "unique and unrepeatable", to quote Pope John Paul II in a public address in the winter of 1979. Marx's "new man" is, after all, made by "the craft of reason", as Hegel put it. The Marxist makes the mistake of confusing degree with kind; for him, quantity of evil is transformed into quality of good. Man remains destitute. Marxist Communism would seem to suggest that men shall have their tools brought back to them, but does not suggest that they shall have restored those spiritual things taken from them by all that is "faceless" in what is so badly called "capitalism".

Book Review

Newman Against the Liberals : 25 Classic Sermons by John Henry Newman, Selected with a Preface by Michael Davies. Augustine Publishing Co., pp. 400.

Michael Davies has done yet another signal service to our religion in compiling this opportune selection from Newman's *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, high-lighting his lifelong conflict with what he called "Liberalism", or what we now call "Modernism". Some such reply was needed to the effrontery of those post-conciliar Modernists who lay claim to Newman as a patron of their heresies. Nothing could be more alien from the real Newman, whose religious thought, even before he became a Catholic, was based entirely on orthodox tradition. He took it directly from the ancient sources, and it brought him gradually and inevitably into the Catholic fold. His constant pursuit of truth and holiness opened his eyes to the evil nature of that liberalism which was then beginning to ravage the Church of England as it is now ravaging, even more destructively, the Catholic Church.

Newman's first major work, *The Arians of the Fourth Century* (1833), was a study of the first great crisis in the Church, which developed a few years after the Council of Nicaea, the first of the General Councils. The heresy of Arius, which denied the divinity of Christ, was there condemned and the true doctrine clearly defined : that Christ is of one and the same substance with the Father, true God of true God. But Arius and his partisans soon returned to the attack, and having won over the Roman Emperor and a large proportion of the bishops, were able to bring the Church to confusion, misery and the verge of collapse. There was a moment when the Pope himself wavered under duress and gave his authority not only to a semi-Arian creed but also to a decree of excommunication against that most outstanding defender of the Faith, St. Athanasius. That crisis was eventually overcome, the Faith was saved and its defenders vindicated. Nor was anything like it to be seen again until our own day, in the Deutero-Vatican

revolution which is still raging, with liberalism and modernism firmly entrenched in high office, religious education and the ex-Catholic press, and the defenders of Catholic tradition relegated to the catacombs. *Exoriare aliquis nostris ex ossibus ultor!* Pending the day of deliverance Newman's study of the Arian crisis might very profitably be read along with these sermons. They belong to the same period of his life-work, and together they throw an abundance of light on our present troubles, which stem, like those of the Arian epoch, from a humanistic substitution of the natural for the supernatural, of mere reason for divine faith, even to the disdeifying of our Lord Himself.

The selected sermons could well serve as an introduction to Newman's complete sermons, the many volumes of which may be found somewhat deterrent—but how rewarding to the persevering reader! For good measure, this volume contains a masterly Introduction by Mgr. Philip Flanagan, placing its contents in relation with Newman's thought as a whole. Those who have read Mgr. Flanagan's recent pamphlet, *Newman, A Guide for our Time* (Augustine Pamphlets, no. 9, same publisher, 40p), will know that no one could have done this better.

As the text here reprinted was unrevised by Newman after his conversion, the reader must be prepared to meet with occasional expressions that fall short of Catholic doctrine; for example, on page 132, line 2, the words "a sinner as others, and" (referring to the Mother of Christ) would need to be suppressed, as also the word "if" in line 8. The wonder is, surely, that these shortcomings were so rare even at that period. Newman was indeed an *anima naturaliter Catholica* and very far from the Liberal Protestantism which has now invaded our Church.

Rev. V. B. Wrighton.

SELLING VERY WELL

The Order of Melchisedech by Michael Davies;
pp. 232; £3.00 (postage 30p.). From,
Augustine Publishing Co.,
South View, Chawleigh,
Chulmleigh, Devon EX18 7HL.